DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 268 UD 018 550

TITLE	Urbanicity and Urban Education: A New Look. ERIC/CUE Disadvantaged Series, Number 52, Fall 1977.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged.; Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. for Urban and Minority Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
CONTRACT	400-75-0008
NOTE	101p.; Proceedings of a conference devoted to redefining the problems of urban education in the context of urban life (Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York, July 18-19, 1977)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	City Problems; Community Characteristics; Educational Resources; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Status; Immigrants; Minority Groups; Population Distribution; Racial Discrimination; Rural to Urban Migration; *School Community Relationship; *Social Factors; Socioeconomic Influences; *Urban Culture; *Urban Education; Urban Environment; *Urban Schools; Urban to Suburban Migration
IDENTIFIERS	California; Massachusetts (Boston)

ABSTRACT

This volume contains speeches made by educators, civil servants and administrators who attended a conference devoted to redefining the problems of education in the context of urban life. Edmund W. Gordon's presentation provides a basic framework of urbanicity, its environmental and social characteristics, and three broad categories which have special relevance for urban education: human diversity, human mobility, and human and institutional rigidity. Robert A. Dentler offers historical and cultural delineations of what constitutes urban and then discusses some of the forces which are modernizing Boston's educational system. Seymour B. Sarason outlines the role of resource exchange networks in education. Paul N. Yivisaker analyzes settlement patterns and their influence on educational trends. Bernard R. Gifford discusses urban education management and related problems. William Riles summarizes educational reform in California and cites examples of California's reform plan for intermediate and secondary education (RISE) being implemented in other states. Davis Seeley's presentation deals with problems in bureaucratic school structures and offers some remedies for improving their effectiveness and efficiency. Summaries of the discussions following the presentations are also included in this document. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159268

ERIC/CUE URBAN DIVERSITY SERIES

Number 52, Fall 1977

URBANICITY AND URBAN EDUCATION

A NEW LOOK

Proceedings of

a small conference devoted to redefining the problems of urban education in the context of urban life. Held at Teachers College, Columbia University, July 18-19, 1977, as part of the Annual Superintendents Work Conference. Sponsored by the Institute for Urban and Minority Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Published by

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION

and

INSTITUTE FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION

Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

UD018550

This publication is one in the ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, under contract 400-75-0008 between the National Institute of Education (DHEW) and Teachers College, Columbia University.

Additional copies will be available from

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P.O. Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210

Its ED identification number and full ordering instructions will be found in Resources in Education, the monthly ERIC abstract journal, or can be obtained by contacting ERIC/CUE.

Copies are also available from the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, for $2.50 each.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the National Institute of Education.

The papers in this volume are a collection of speeches made at a conference held at Teachers College on July 18 and 19, 1977. This conference, Urbanicity and Urban Education: A New Look, was part of the annual Superintendents Work Conference held at Teachers College. It was sponsored by the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, and was attended by school superintendents from all over the country.

Edmund Gordon, who writes the Introduction to this collection, is Professor of Education in the Department of Applied Human Development and Guidance at Teachers College, Columbia University; Clinical Professor of Pediatric Psychology, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; and Director of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education. Robert A. Dentler is Dean of the College of Education, Boston University. Seymour B. Sarason is Professor of Psychology, School of Organization and Management, Yale University. Paul N. Ylvisaker is Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, and Charles William Eliot Professor of Education at Harvard. Bernard Gifford was, at the time of this conference, Deputy Chancellor, New York City Board of Education, and is currently Controller, Russell Sage Foundation. Wilson Riles is Superintendent of Public Education for the State of California. David S. Seeley is Director of the Public Education Association, New York City.

INTRODUCTION

Toward a Conceptualization of Urban Education

Edmund W. Gordon

One of the areas in education that has received a great deal of attention in recent years is urban education. So recent is the concern under this rubric that the third edition of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research carries only one such index term, and it refers to an urban-rural comparison of the number of secondary schools. Nonetheless, the attention of educators has been progressively drawn to the challenges and opportunities posed by education in urban areas, as these communities have accounted for more and more of our population. In the last few decades, enrollment in urban schools has steadily increased. This shift in population; the large concentration of human, monetary, and other resources in these schools; the cultural/political/social influences of urban centers on the nation; and the problems attendant to these factors have resulted in the growing concern for urban education. However, despite the large amount of discussion and work on this subject, there is little clarity with respect to the question: of what does this domain of education consist?

Studies of urban living and its consequences for education tend to focus on issues related to ethnic minority status and low socioeconomic status. This emphasis is a reflection of the fact that the city is now where low status people are concentrated. It does not mean that there are not poor people or black people, Spanish-speaking people, and Native American people in the less highly populated areas (in fact, before 1930 these peoples were concentrated in the rural areas); but now the largest concentrations of these peoples and the largest numbers are in our cities. For example, in the early part of this century studies of black Americans focused primarily on rural areas because if one wanted to find black Americans in those days, that was where they were. In contrast, in the past two decades, investigators concerned with the problems of black people have had to turn to our great cities to find the largest concentrations, because of their shift from rural to urban living. Similarly, if one goes into the Native American ghettos of Brooklyn or Chicago, one will find the largest concentrations of Native Americans in our nation. We have more Indians in these two cities than we have on any single reservation in this country.

This population shift has led us to equate urban education with the problems of low status persons. However, there are problems more critical to urban life and certainly more crucially related to the future of our society than the problems faced by low status people in our cities. This is not to demean or underestimate the importance of ethnic discrimination or the importance of poverty in the lives of people. These are tremendously important issues, and society must do something about them. Rather, this is to suggest that professionals often greatly confuse the problems of urban education with the problems of these special populations. As a result, we may be doing a disservice to low status populations, to the concerned professions, and to the domains of minority education and urban education by treating the two as if they were synonymous.

The history of the human species has been marked by a continuous movement toward greater congregation, that is, toward the concentration of human beings in social collectives. This movement can be traced from the very episodic, random team efforts of early hominids at hunting; we can see it in the early food-gathering activities of man. We can trace it through the emergence of the family, the clan, and the tribal kinship relationships--all efforts directed at mutual protection, at mutual food gathering, at mutual food cultivation and territorial establishment. We can see this movement through the enslavement and control practiced by feudal lords and slaveholders. We can see it in the population concentrations made necessary by the Industrial Revolution. We can see it in the organized and cooperative enslavement and control practiced by the lords of capitalism, and even more recently by the lords of socialism. It continues in the cultural and ideological confluence made possible by modern communicative technology.

We have seen growth from villages to towns and from towns to cities. We have seen cities become metropolises, and those metropolises have now become large continuous metropolitan belts. We can identify a number of characteristics of this growing metropolitanization--an aspect of what we will call urbanicity.

Urban areas are characterized by large numbers of people, by high densities, by great diversity and heterogeneity of characteristics and concerns of people, by high degrees of mobility, a relatively high incidence of anonymity, by conflicting life-styles in close proximity, by cultural richness, by the concentration of human and material resources, by ease of communication and geographic mobility, and by the coexistence of fluidity and rigidity in institutional and personal behavior. This is just to name a few characteristics, all of which confront us with challenge and opportunity.

In discussing these, as they are both positive and negative, we tend to focus most of our attention on population magnitude and density. But while all these characteristics were originally associated primarily with magnitude and density, increasingly they are now associated with the complexities of modern technological societies. One of the important aspects of all or most of the characteristics we associate with urbanicity, or urban living, is that they are a part of the experience of almost all people in our country--thanks to modern communication and transportation.

Urbanicity as a societal condition is most evident from the fact that better than half of our population lives in urban areas, and the remainder of the population is familiar with, and greatly influenced by, these urban areas. This is to say that people in this country no longer live in isolation, even those in rural areas, mostly because of the effects of mass media and technological advances in communication. More and more, the people of this country have come to share many of the same experiences; develop similar "national" characteristics; and become familiar with the customs, ideologies, and idiosyncrasies common to this nation and its various peoples. In other words, these United States of America have become urbanized. We are essentially an urban nation despite our rural beginnings.

Abner Cohen (Urban Ethnicity, 1974) argues that urban anthropology must begin to take into account the fact that our society is becoming more and more urban. He writes, "In both the developed and the developing countries the city is today but a part of the national state. Economically, politically, demographically, and culturally it [the city] makes no sociological sense unless we study it within this wider context. Urban Anthropology is indeed the anthropology of the complex structure of the new national state." If this can be said of the city, the same may be said of our rural areas. It is the urban character of the modern nation that makes urbanicity a national state of mind, if not a universal geographic phenomenon. This line of thought cannot be limited to anthropology. It is also the framework in which we must consider education.

The problems and opportunities of urban education, then, are not simply those related to education in our cities, but increasingly urban education must be defined as including education in what is rapidly becoming an urban nation. We must begin to understand urban education in reference to the "new national state." In other words, our study of urban education must take into account an understanding of urbanicity as one of the prime characteristics of the modern technological society.

There is a special quality to the interactions that are peculiar to urban communities--not that interactions do not occur in other communities, but the great concentrations of people, resources, sources of stimulation, money, and conflicts in the urban society provide interactions which have the potential for greatly influencing the developmental process in man. We once thought that what we identify as "human" in man is largely a product of some inborn pattern that simply unfolds to maturity. Increasingly, students of human behavior and social organization look to the interactions between whatever is given in an organism and whatever is given in the environmental situation in order to understand human development. To identify this as the source of the product of the social behavior, the personal behavior, the intellectual behavior or almost any aspect of behavior, the definition, the identification, the specification, and eventually the manipulation of those interactions may be the most crucial tool that man has for influencing the development of man. To ignore this leaves the developmental process largely to chance.

The environments in which people live have always influenced the course of their development. What is new is the broadened commonality of these environmental encounters; the increased awareness of incongruencies heightened by the temporal and spacial contiguity of pluralistic elements; and the requirement that individuals learn to adjust to and survive in varied and rapidly changing milieus. The richness of the urban environment and its potential for isolation, deprivation, and overstimulation confront us with interactions of tremendously positive and negative power and thus present us with a developmental paradox of contradiction.

Characteristic of all types of societies is the problem of contradiction. For every phenomenon, there is a positive side and a negative side. These opposites do not maintain their positions--they are dynamic. At one point one aspect of the contradiction may be in the ascendancy; at another point another aspect of the contradiction is in the ascendancy. The task of those of us who deal creatively with contradiction is to understand those relative positions, the ways in which those relative positions can be utilized for particular goals, and the ways in which those relative positions cannot be changed but must be adapted to.

The urban setting is one of conflicting pressures--congruency and incongruency. Just as there are diverse positions, there are conflicts of interest, lack of congruency between the interests of one group and those of another. When we talk about large and congested populations and, in addition, diverse populations, we must talk about the lack of congruence between the many subgroups that make up these populations. Incongruence between the various elements of the society, then, is a special characteristic of urbanicity.

Different social and political groups may become more isolated from one another in the urban situation than in less complex societies, in part because the numbers in each group increase significantly. The sense of community and the necessity for it may outweigh the diversity of opinions in rural settings; whereas in urban settings, the large membership of each group allows different social communities to develop in isolation around different values. Thus contamination in adherence to values across group lines becomes less, as differences of opinion lead to group identity in urban society. Multiplicity of values, multiplicity of cultural forms, and multiplicity of interests, for example, are reflected in the social adaptability of the people in this country. In addition, social adaptation is closely tied to people's position in society. Yet, for a society to move ahead smoothly as well as for development to move smoothly in individuals, a sense of congruence, of fitting together, of orchestration, must be experienced. Adaptation then becomes an issue. Certainly as society becomes more closely knit, as people become more interdependent, and influence each other more, their lives become more and more dependent upon successful adaptation to each other. The capacity to adapt and readapt in the face of contradiction and change emerges as a crucial survival skill in the urban society. Alvin Toffler talks about this concept in the context of adapting to change. Perhaps adaptation in relation to change, if we follow Toffler, may be the most important skill that we need to develop in man, as we become more urbanized and more and more interdependent.

The members of a modern society come to be more and more uniformly influenced by the predominant trends of that society. We can think of urbanicity in this context. A youngster growing up in rural Mississippi with TV, radio, and various other forms of communication and transportation, is not as uninfluenced by what happens in Kansas City, Chicago, or New York as we once thought. Adaptation, then, to those varieties of inputs, which are a function of the fact that even though we have urban and rural areas everyone is influenced by the urban domination of society, becomes of crucial importance. In order to exist in this society, we must all develop the capacity to adapt, to utilize ourselves in purposefully creative ways in response to the varieties of inputs, the varieties of stimuli that are increasingly present.

Continuity and change present problems in urban areas. Large, dense populations with their growing sense of anonymity tend to lose the control over individual behavior which was possible in the small rural community. The possitility for change then is ever present. At the same time, the weight of

the organization--the bureaucracy that has been established to maintain the system--becomes a countervailing force toward conformity, even though individuals can get lost in the system and thus have the freedom to be erratic. Man needs continuity in his experiences, but the essence of growth or movement is the function of the tension that exists in the system between the old and the new. In other words, there has to be an awareness of the possibility for change in order to stimulate the kind of movement that individuals need in order to grow, develop, and be creative.

As the magnitude and the density of the population increases and as the impact of the population on those individuals in society increases, identity, individualization, and group survival come into conflict. We are a nation that has given high priority through most of our history to the concept of individuality--the independence of the individual and autonomous behavior. Yet, as our society becomes more urbanized and more congested, and as population density increases, it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain "my" identity, protect "my" rights to individuality at the same time that we do something about the problems of collective need and group survival.

In his very interesting work, A Theory of Justice, Rawls argues that justice cannot be said to exist when the rights of one individual are violated to serve the purposes or ends of a larger segment of the society. What we are increasingly confronted with is the problem of reconciling differing needs and values which may be contradictory or where the achievement of one set of needs is counterproductive to the achievement of another. As people congregate in larger numbers and these contradictory positions become more obvious, traditional democratic strategies based upon majority rule may not be relevant. Urbanicity may force us to learn new ways of social organization and governance.

Urban existence makes the issue of critical mass very important. One of the greatest problems of an urban society has to do with the establishment, maintenance and the control of the utilization of the mass of resources--whether we talk of human resources or technological resources, a mass that is sufficient to make a difference in the society or to make a difference in the life of a person. Identifying the level of the magnitude of the mass necessary to particular processes and the ways in which that mass may be and needs to be manipulated either to produce effective education or effective health service or effective religious or political organization, is of critical concern for a nation that has become urban.

Against the background of these characteristics and problems of urbanicity, what then are its central features which have

particular implications for education? There follow three broad categories which have special relevance for urban education: human diversity, human mobility, and human and institutional rigidity.

My own concern with the first category, diversity of human characteristics, developed out of my concern with low ethnic and low economic status populations. In earlier work great attention was given to the characteristics of these populations and the ways in which they differ from the so-called majority population. As that work progressed, we have come to realize that it was in error. The article published in the December 1965 Review of Educational Research, in which we discussed some of the characteristics of disadvantaged people, was inappropriate; not simply in the sense that it stigmatized those people by calling them "culturally disadvantaged," but, even more important, by asserting that they represented a relatively homogeneous group. They do not. They have poverty and low status and certain kinds of neglect and maltreatment as common characteristics, but in terms of the functional characteristics for that population, their characteristics vary as much within these groups as they do between the lower and higher status groups.

An increasingly urgent problem of urban communities, therefore, is the fact of the diversity of human characteristics. We must examine that diversity. Perhaps those characteristics we have previously judged to be important--that is, ethnic status and class status--may only be important for political purposes and may be relatively unimportant for pedagogical purposes. If the task is to organize the learning experiences of Johnny Jones, I am less convinced in 1977 than I was in 1965 that knowing his ethnicity or class background is sufficient. Far more important is knowing how that youngster goes about solving social and intellectual problems. In psychology we call that affective and cognitive style. Some people approach tasks in the abstract, and other people are totally at a loss when they are confronted with an abstract problem, but depend on concrete representation--on things they can touch or taste, hear or see. Some people approach tasks globally, that is they have the ability to quickly assess an entire situation and deal with it. Other people have to deal with small details--pieces of the whole.

There is a relatively highly developed body of knowledge that relates to the ways in which people differ in functional aspects of both intellectual and social behavior. That knowledge has not crept into the practice of education. Our concern has been with populations that we know to differ on broad characteristics of social status (social, economic, sex, ethnicity), but these status characteristics may not supply sufficient information

to adequately provide for educational planning. Perhaps we need to give more attention to differences in the functional characteristics which better inform instruction.

A category of functional characteristics which has received considerable study is temperament. Birch, Chess, and Thomas have spent the last twenty years working on problems of the temperamental differences in children. Their research suggests that there are characteristics of temperament that are identifiable in children at about three months of age. As a youngster progresses through the years--they have followed their population through the nineteenth year--those same temperaments, identified in the early years, still dominate in the behavior of these now young adults. Birch and Gordon worked with newborn infants. They found what are perhaps the precursors of temperament expressed in the very first hours of children's lives. If correct, it may be that one person's deliberate, analytic, slow-to-arrive-at-a-decision temperament, as opposed to another's tendency to be impulsive, and quick to arrive at a decision--synergistic rather than analytic--is a characteristic that is a function of the way in which the nervous system is organized.

In the book Temperament and Behavior Disorders, Chess suggests that perhaps as much as 50 percent of the learning problems and behavior disorders of youngsters are a function of a failure to achieve a match between their temperamental traits and the temperamental demands of recurrent learning situations. In other words, if a youngster is a quick, impulsive child, who moves with dispatch in whatever he does, and a parent or teacher is deliberate, analytical, slow and constantly holds back the child, that youngster may be being educated and socialized to his disadvantage. His strength is not being built upon but rather a pattern which is atypical for him is being forced. The opposite situation is also true. A youngster may have the same capacity to comprehend as any other, but is handicapped, disadvantaged, maltreated because the learning environment is at variance with his dominant temperamental traits.

There is a broad body of research relating to temperament, interest, and cognitive style, but this knowledge is not being adequately integrated into educational procedures. As important as it is to give greater attention to the social-cultural characteristics of young people in the pattern of their educational experiences, we must begin to give even more attention to those functional characteristics which inform the educational process. Diversity of human characteristics, then, becomes of very important concern.

This concern with diversity increases in importance as populations increase in size and density. In simpler and smaller groups, time and circumstances permit greater freedom to find one's way. In the slower, less pressured traditional communities, there seems to have been greater capacity to tolerate behavioral deviance. True, there were limits to this tolerance, but feelings of familiarity, kinship, and community seem to have made for greater readiness to absorb mild degrees and amounts of atypicality. The urban community, on the other hand, seems to provide more resources for dealing with diversity but less supportive tolerance. The tolerance of difference associated with urbanicity tends to be tolerance by isolation and neglect. There is just so much going on that needs attention that nobody notices, and too often nobody cares. Diversity increases and nurturant toleration decreases.

Related to human diversity is a concern for pluralism. While our population differs widely in its characteristics, it also differs in its values. And though at one period of our history we had a kind of amalgamation with respect to standards and values, we are increasingly becoming a pluralistic society in which many values and many standards exist in parallel. A pluralistic society that plans to give attention to the development of people not only must take into account the diversities in characteristics that people bring to the developmental situation, but also the society must help people develop against the background of the variety of standards and criteria suggested by the outcomes to which peoples' various behaviors are directed. That variation in outcomes and values is a fact of life; yet, one needs in urban society to be able to function against the criteria of the broader group as well as the criteria of multiple settings. We cannot prepare a youngster to live only in rural Texas, because we know that in his lifetime he may spend his childhood in San Francisco, work and mature in New York, and die in Portland. After all, several of our Presidents have been born and spent their childhoods in very remote and isolated parts of this country. Yet when they function as President, they are expected to reflect the collective sophistication and wisdom of our metropolises. We cannot socialize a person to only one set of standards when we know that in the course of that person's life she/he is going to have to exist in a variety of other cultural settings that make different kinds of demands for adaptation. In a pluralistic society, then, people must be taught how to exist in and adapt to a variety of different situations. Thus, pluralism in a society presents tremendously important problems for education which we have not yet tackled.

A second characteristic of urbanicity which has implications for education is population mobility--or actually, mobility and immobility. The problem basically refers to geographic mobility and social immobility. Clearly, as our urban nation advances, the fact of physical movement becomes increasingly possible for people. Not only is there physical mobility, but there is psychological mobility. We can sit in Omaha and observe now by television something that is happening in London, or almost anywhere in the world. It may be--given the capacity of human beings to deal with vicarious experience--that these vicarious and artificially created mobilities have the same importance in the development of persons as that of physical mobility. Physical mobility encompasses both the capacity of the society to put people in a variety of settings and the requirements of those settings that people adapt to them. This is cultural mobility.

Social mobility is a related phenomenon. In the early development of this country there were vast open spaces, relatively undeveloped industries, opportunities for relatively unsophisticated people to quickly rise to political position. Movement up and down the social scale was a fact of life. The Horatio Alger myth--that is, the capacity of persons to move from very low status to very high achievement in our society--is still possible, but it is so rare as to be a misleading assertion of opportunity for youngsters in this country. The number of people who can actually move from very low beginnings on to high status in our society is very, very limited. In addition, it is questionable whether the opportunities for upward mobility were ever as great as the myth claimed they were. But it is certainly true that it was easier to make a fortune or achieve high status in some areas of the country in the 1800s than it is in the late 1900s.

The fact that we are more and more subjected to caste status--that is, relatively fixed social position--becomes an important issue as we begin to think about the impact now of opportunity development on the development of individuals in an urban nation. Ogbu has written about the way in which the perception of opportunity for upward mobility may be related to education. If one perceives that one's chances for movement in the society, and for the utilization of the things that one invests one's efforts in, in education, are rather slight or not as good as those of another group in society, then the effort made to get equally involved in that educational opportunity is viewed as futile. In other words, if we recognize that the unemployment rate for black youths in this country is about 30 to 40 percent and sometimes approaches 50 percent, and if we talk to those youngsters about the opportunities that this country

provides if they do their homework, we are being dishonest and they know it. In order to truly improve education, then, we may have to involve ourselves in changing the opportunity structure that those youngsters perceive, since without doing so, we cannot adquately involve them in the educational process.

Fluidity and rigidity is the final category to be discussed. As societies become more compressed, more urbanized, they almost automatically develop structures to regulate themselves--bureaucracies. One of the functions of the bureaucracy, one of the functions of institutions of social control, is stability. There must be enough stability for efficient management. Stability in the hands of human beings most often gets reflected as rigidity. We are creatures of habit, and getting us to change a decision, a behavior, an organization or an opportunity structure becomes very difficult. Yet, if there were no system, no structure, no bureaucracy in urban societies, they would fall apart. We pay the price of rigidity for that stability, which makes it difficult for these same institutions to be flexible enough to serve the varied interests of diverse populations. Diversity and rigidity then represent contradictory forces.

In New York City, for instance, there is no lack of understanding in the educational system for the needs of the diverse students in it. But the translation of that understanding into direct services for students, mediated by a bureaucracy that is intent upon protecting itself and protecting that system, creates a rigidity in the behavior of that institution that makes it impossible to adequately serve youngsters. We must find some way of dealing with that kind of institutional rigidity, since the more we become urbanized, the more bureaucracy, the more structure, and the more rigidity we are going to have. And, the increasing rigidity of the system is counterproductive of the things to which we in education are supposedly committed.

Rigidity is also a characteristic of the behavior of individuals. In our highly advanced society, we have more knowledge, more technology than we use. Take smoking for example. Few people in this country are unaware of the deleterious effects smoking has on the health of the person who smokes, as well as on those who must breathe the smoke in the air, yet millions continue to smoke. Getting people to use the information and change their behavior to correspond with the new knowledge is a terribly difficult task. Those of us who teach know that one of the poorest ways of helping people to understand is to preach to them; yet we continue to use exhortation.

This type of rigidity is evident in education--since the teachers and administrators are human. For example, in Pittsburgh, Robert Glazer instituted an individually prescribed instruction program. The IPI is an innovative step in the development of education, but as I went from classroom to classroom, I found the teachers using the best materials--materials that are sensitive to differential rates of learning--but using those materials in the same way they had used their previous materials, that is, in teaching groups of thirty children. In other words, the behavior simply did not follow the understanding of the technology that was available.

It may be that we hold on to the familiar, that which we know, out of a need for security. This tends to occur even in the absence of threat. When orientation and security are threatened either by the introduction of the new or by other changed circumstances, the tendency is to more deeply entrench the present pattern.

One of the facts, then, of human behavior is its rigidity. And unless we find ways to make us more flexible, we are going to serve the goals of education less well. However, one big advantage of large populations, and of the anonymity that comes with this, is the freedom for individuals to "do their own thing." In a small setting it is difficult to do anything different and not be noticed or even restrained. One of the advantages, then, of urbanicity is that it does provide for greater individual freedom. One of the disadvantages is that the weight of it, the rigidity of it, makes the expression of that freedom far more difficult.

One of the great scholars early in this century wrote that the problem of the twentieth century was the problem of the color line. But just before he left the country, in 1960, DuBois said that he had changed that position. Not that he thought that color was unimportant, but that he thought that there were other differences between people that were of greater importance. Primary among them, he said, was the problem of politics and economics. He suggested that until we begin to appreciate the interplay between the politics of a society, the economics of that society, and the fact that differences between the members of that society exist, we are not going to make much progress.

It may be that what we do in education, urban or nonurban, over the next few years may be more greatly influenced by things that happen in the political/economic sphere--what we do in efforts at controlling, anticipating, manipulating, and utilizing the political economy of the society--than the things that we do in education itself. For example, we must be cognizant of a force

like the influx of the strategies of organized labor into the pedagogical processes and the educational system. What has happened in New York City is that despite the fact that the state law places responsibility for educational policy making in the hands of lay board members, in essense, policy is made by the United Federation of Teachers. Nothing happens in that system without the approval of the UFT. It is not that we are against unions, but as unionism becomes a new force for reaction or conservatism, serving the private interests of workers rather than the collective interests of the children and their education, we are in trouble. That is a problem of politics and economics. In addition, unless we can bring monetary resources to bear on the problems of education, where necessary, we are not going to solve them. The problems of education in this country are not going to be solved with expenditures of $2 billion of federal money and $100 billion totally across the country, for example--it is just not enough. The estimate of what would be required to provide good education in this country, made ten years ago without the latest rates of inflation, was about $100 billion. Today it may well be $150 billion. Until we can begin to allocate that kind of money, adjusted for inflation, the best of our ability, and the best of our professional and technological resources to the problems of education--all this in a society that has become urban with all of its problems and all of its advantages--we will not be very successful.

The fact of shrinking resources is a problem for all urban centers right now. It is probably most exacerbated in New York City, but the mayors of cities around the country have alerted us to the fact that serious financial complications are just ahead for these cities also. Some economists are suggesting that what we see happening in the cities is simply a precursor of the financial difficulties we will be facing on a national scale. Not only have costs greatly increased and appear to be continuing to escalate, but the willingness of people to support education and other public services through their taxes is declining. Therefore in thinking about the economic issues, not only are costs higher and continuing to rise and financial need greater than the amount of money currently assigned to it, but the combination of the growing problem and the changing climate of support for education, or for public services in general, suggests that the economic base from which we could anticipate to produce the money that is needed is disintegrating. We see then, that the financial plight of the cities is also the plight of all government units in the country.

All of this is further complicated by the recent advent of multinational corporations, which are depriving national governments of sources of income. Not only are sources of income

decreasing, but the more developed countries are also being deprived of sources of employment. As the denials of public services in these settings increase and the capacity to raise money through the taxation of people decreases, the cost of providing a service like education in a highly complex society is rising at the same time that the available resources to meet these costs are diminishing.

What then are the major issues confronting urban education and by which this field may be defined? The environment in which urban education exists is marked by contradiction. The paradox of the urban environment is that it is most inhibiting at the same time that it is most liberating. This paradox includes a number of polarities such as extreme differences in people, in life space, in conditions of life, and in the concentration of power and resources. The polarities can be traced from the individual's need to be both anonymous and a member of a small restricted group, to the possibility of institutions being either most open to change or most rigid. It can be observed in school systems which include the most advanced and the most retrogressive. This paradoxical phenomenon of contradiction is a key feature of the urban community and is a key to understanding urban education. A definition of urban education, or the mapping of its domain, must include the cultural, economic, geographic, political, psychological, and sociological paradoxes of contradiction inherent in urbanicity.

The urban community is characterized by collectivity, the idea that the urban setting forces people to be identified with, and by, groups to a greater degree than do nonurban environments. Increased competition for resources and power in the urban arena can focus on the school and exacerbate the need for and function of collectivities, whether these collectivities are formed on the basis of conceptions of ethnicity, shared normative behaviors, religious culture, or other interests. The idea of collectivities includes the concepts of membership, the individual within the group, communication and support networks, geographic and political locations, status and function.

Urban institutions, as are most institutions, are characterized by rigidity, that is a stronger commitment to the maintenance of the status quo than to change. As populations and complexities of organization increase, bureaucracies develop and become entrenched. Again the paradox. Bigness and complexity demand flexibility, but to function and survive complex societies and their institutions must have continuity, consistency, and stability. Not only are these institutions characterized by rigidity, but the people they serve show rigidity in their behavior; adaptation and change are hard to come by.

Urban populations are diverse and mobile and at the same time stereotypic and immobile. These populations vary with respect to their status (ethnicity, culture, class, sex) and their functions (language, cognitive style, affective response patterns, etc.). These differences have important implications for the ways in which educational opportunities are designed and delivered. Yet these various groups are eventually held to similar mainstream standards despite the pluralistic nature of their idiosyncratic reference groups. Those populations seem to be in constant geographic movement within the city and into and out of the city, yet between groups movement is very limited and upward mobility more a dream than a reality.

In essence pedagogy is pedagogy in rural and urban settings; but education, as the process by which pedagogical experiences and opportunities are designed, developed, and implemented, is greatly influenced by the social context in which it exists. In urban education attention must be given to these and other aspects of urbanicity. As the nation becomes more urban, all education is significantly influenced by this phenomenon.

What Should Be Urban about Education

Boston: A Case in Point

Robert A. Dentler

It is a pleasure to share in your combined program this morning. Two years ago I came to New York City at the kind invitation of Carroll Johnson to talk about Boston's school case and to discover what it is we think we are doing up there. Refreshed by the encounter with school administrators from across the country, I returned home with a changed perspective.

This morning I want to talk about a more theoretical question, but I cannot resist connecting it with the only thing I seem to know anything about anymore--after more than three years of daily immersion--namely, the Boston school situation. I don't know whether one can generalize about Boston's condition. For a social scientist, that might be viewed as irresponsible; but I'll throw myself dependently upon you. You can gauge whether it is or isn't.

Those of you who are from parts of the country where it's culturally permissible still to cooperate or to do things collaboratively with one another will take heart from the non-cooperative privatistic emphasis of a provincial city in the northeast.

I want to begin by trying to delineate a few of the dimensions of what should be urban about education. Most of what I have to say here is better said at greater length in the following sources: my own book, Urban Problems: Perspectives and Solutions, which came out in 1977; an earlier but important collection of essays edited by Myron Weiner, Modernization, which was published in 1966; and a recent collection of essays by Daniel Levine and Robert Havighurst, The Future of Big City Schools.

In order to talk about what should be urban about education, one would have to ask, what is urban? And the reason we have to ask this question has two aspects. One is worldwide and historical, the other cultural. The urban condition of human settlement and cultural organization is relatively recent in human experience. Although the cities go back to the very beginning of crop domestication, the number of peoples living in such modes was very small until the seventeenth century. And so when we talk about what is urban, we talk about it against the backdrop of very recent experience. Second, if we limit ourselves to North America, it is hard for us to imagine what is urban, because we inhabit a

society that is founded upon profoundly rural premises. The Constitution itself is the product of profoundly rural biases. The Jeffersonian and Jacksonian eras cast the die for generations to follow.

So, when we say what is urban, we begin with what is almost socially undesirable. That is, urban is what your children were not supposed to head for if you were living in 1890 in a rural village or on a farm. When they did head for the cities, you bemoaned their disappearance. Urban is what Sister Carrie headed for on that train that took her, not to her fondest dreams, but to the sewing machine in the sweatshop. Urban is where those gleaming lights excite your pulse, make you nervous and pathological, according to sociologists who wrote on the subject as recently as the 1920s. The city is a kind of social pathology to be avoided at all costs, they said, as they stared out of their Riverside Drive apartment windows.

We can surmount these two limitations, one historical and one cultural, and try to talk about what is urban in a neutral way. The most immediate facet is an extremely high order of interdependence. An example of this was the onset, the duration, and the consequences of the blackout in New York City in the summer of 1977. If you watched the ramifications of the blackout on the supply of medical material, on a justice system which was incapable of so much as arraigning the 1,500 arrested who languished in jail several days later, you will know what I mean by extremely high interdependence.

Another characteristic of what is urban is the geographic range and scale. By geographic range, I mean that there are location specialties inside an urb which are fitted out for these interdependent activities. Nearly every imaginable human function has a place location somewhere within the urb. And the scale of these places must be very great before we would apply this notion of urban.

Anthropolotists have long been interested in the notion of the population mix or composition of communities; and in attempting to define urban communities we would say that the population mix approximates that of the national society. The population mix of an urb is one which contains all of the conceivable--or nearly all of the conceivable--age, sex, ethnic, socioreligious, and occupational types available to the society as a whole. That is to say, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in the spring of each year, hosts some 30,000 college students. Its population at that moment more than quadruples. This does not make Fort Lauderdale an urban community. This makes Fort Lauderdale a retirement community temporarily infested by late adolescents.

So one of the ways that you would delineate an urban community is to draw the boundary in such a way that you contained a representative and by and large thoroughly adequate sample of the population characteristic of the national society as a whole. Now, this means that cities in North America today are not urban. They are only partially urban. Their populations exclude portions of a representative and adequate sample. So, too, the suburban satellites of the former urbs are partial communities. In order even to have an adequate conception of what is urban today, we must talk about a metro or a metropolitan community, which is not Miami, but Dade County, which is not New York City, but at the minimum a twelve-county area that contains the five boroughs of New York City. It is not Boston proper, but the Greater Boston Metropolitan Area, which contains some thirty-six suburban centers.

The people who live in the urb and the suburbs think they live in communities. In fact, one of the pivotal features of life in a metropolitan area is that children grow up behaving as if they inhabit a community. The working fathers and mothers know better. They may not even be available all day long, so the children have to pretend that they occupy a place in a community. Each generation goes through that imaginary community-building experience and public school educators participate in maintaining that illusion. They have school-community relations, for example. They conduct elementary school social studies which pretend that there is a community that is inhabited by themselves and the students, although the teaching force may reside on the other side of the metro and be completely unfamiliar with the school surroundings.

An urb is not only a representative and adequate population sample, but its economy balances its vast range of human types with a vast range of interdependent services. In economic theory terms, this balance constitutes the very enhanced life chances that bring people to inhabit urban settlements in the first place. The reason Sister Carrie got on the train, you may remember, was in order to seek out opportunities. Opportunities translate across urban society to mean improved life chances. One lives longer, one lives more completely, etc. And so there are structural constraints inside metropolitan area communities which constitute a press on the range of economic services on the one hand and their fit to the vast range representative of human social types on the other. When this is in some kind of homeostatic balance, we say life chances have been optimized. Now this is like a macro version of the notion that a high school ought to be large enough to offer a program that is expressive of the range of contemporary knowledge or contemporary realms of meaning.

So, too, the metropolitan community swells constantly and densifies in a kind of effort to achieve this balance between services and types. For this reason, something that is essentially urban is the sense of the lack of balance that is precipitated. There is a dialogue among human types which says, "We don't have this or that service, we're short of this. We're in short supply. We're gypped." This is a conversation which doesn't fit more rural and often fatalistic folk settlements.

Another structural characteristic of an urb is that it is a source of psychic identification. Children build an identification with a neighborhood, and they act as if that neighborhood is a world; but as they grow up, they are capable of identifying with a whole metropolitan area community. So you see the twenty-to-thirty-year-old set in the greater Boston metropolitan area, for example, identifying directly with the Bruins, the Boston Red Sox, the Celtics, the Boston Bolts, the Lobsters, and the Patriots, who do not play downtown, but rather far out on the edge of the metro.

Again, urban has been confused with many things. Its main confusion has been with cities. And here I'm trying to specify what was once an adequate characteristic. If you want to go back and read about an earlier era, you should read Robert Lynd's Middletown. It is the story of Muncie, Indiana, a self-sufficient manufacturing city in the Midwest just before the war. Muncie was urban. Muncie today is not urban. Greater Muncie is urban. Keep in mind this matter of a city exploding and forming a metropolitan area, if you want to try to think about what is urban and what should be urban about education.

Alex Inkeles has tried hard for a quarter of a century to specify some of the social, psychological characteristics of modernization. I want to link some of his ideas about modernization to this characterization of what is urban, because urban, here meaning metropolitan, is the context in which people strain to improve their life chances by perfecting the balance between services and human needs and interests. And therefore, what is urban is also a strain toward worldwide modernization. The trouble with talking about modernization is that, unlike the notion of city, modernization in American culture is socially desirable. Therefore, when we list the attributes of modernization, we list things which some of us at least tend to approve of socially. But I do want to link these things with our otherwise antiurban bias and try to indicate that the trend toward modernization of the human condition is a trend that is essentially metropolitan in nature. It's something that the population witnesses and hungers toward.

Here are a few of Inkeles' characteristics of modernization as it concerns individuals: receptive to new experiences, open to change, prone to form opinions on issues beyond their own environment, think that it is possible to plan and to organize beliefs about life, are oriented to the present more than to the past, have a notion--even in the middle of the blackout--that the environment can be mastered, rather than the environment dominating the human settlement. The modernization process is one which induces confidence that the world is what Inkeles called "calculable." It generates the belief that others can be relied upon. The basis for urban commerce and governments, the modernization process is dependent fundamentally upon urbanization. It induces respect for others and an awareness of a dignity of other persons across that population mix that I described. Modernization includes and advocates science and technology, subject to periodic lapses into skepticism, or even despair. And, according to Inkeles, worldwide, the modernization process generates the belief in distributive justice in the civil case, and equity in the educational case.

Let's take these urban dimensions and these social psychological attributes of Inkeles' that I submit are attributes toward which the metropolitan man tends; and let's consider them in the light of some historic and current developments in the Boston public school system. Here, please insert either your own public school system, if you are part of a metropolitan area; or pick the metropolitan area closest to you.

The Boston public schools were organized from the outset on the premise of being the antithesis to urban modernism. That is to say, 140 years ago, the system began as an antidote in part to the peril of Irish Catholics who were then still safely confined to the dock areas, but who appeared likely to penetrate other areas of the city. The public school system was arranged as a lockout, as a place for the Yankees to attend school and learn the rural pieties. The traces of that ruralism can be found in Horace Mann's more universalist writings. In short, the public schools started up in Boston--one of the earliest systems in the United States to come forth full blown--in such a way as to generate a large-scale parochial system side by side. Then, as the Irish Catholics succeeded in penetrating the public as well as establishing the parochial system, the Yankee establishment had to enforce its earlier creation of a nonpublic, private network of academies.

Thus, what we have is something preventing the emergence of the balance of the human types and services, the enhancements of the life chances of the source that I was referring to earlier.

Furthermore, the public schools were established on an extremely decentralized basis so that they were owned and operated, so far as their services were concerned, on a neighborhood basis. Now, it takes a long time to grow neighborhoods whose inhabitants are convinced that there is no other human settlement just beyond the border. But this is the case. That is, I have met, in the last three years, hundreds of citizens of East Boston, now known as the Strip, adjacent to Logan Airport and once a thriving neighborhood, who have never left East Boston and are convinced that it would be dangerous to interact with the people who inhabit other localities nearby, such as Charlestown and South Boston. The interaction that clings to these communities is best expressed ritually in the spring and summer boxing matches where it's legitimate for the adults to gather and watch the adolescents pound one another around the ring. No one stays overnight out of his neighborhood.

The public schools grew up in each of a dozen neighborhoods. And each of the dozen neighborhoods grew up as a reinforcer of the ethnic identity and separateness of its population. Each neighborhood was given away very reluctantly by the Yankee shareholders who had developed the total area initially. To secure a foothold in South Boston in a sense cost hundreds of thousands of Irish Catholic lives across the period of a century. South Boston is not much of a foothold. It's on the edge of the ocean, it's very shallow. That is to say, one could be very easily pressed into the sea there. There is nowhere else to go except into a vast railroad yard which separates it from the remainder of Boston. So too, East Boston is separated. That is the Italian-American foothold. Charlestown is separated. It is linked to Boston by two bridges. It's a thin shelf along the opposite side of the Charles River. What you have, then, is a city not designed for the metropolitanization and modernization that I was referring to, but designed as its antithesis.

Yankees who designed the public school system, also developed a committee, or board of education, in such a way as to guarantee its ethnic purity. The positions on the Boston School Committee were unpaid and were occupied by wealthy Yankee Brahmins throughout the nineteenth century. As the system's teaching force became increasingly Irish-American, so Irish-Americans began to run for election to the Committee. When the Committee became 100 percent Irish-American shortly before the turn of the century, it also became virtually bankrupt. Members could not afford to run for election, and they could not afford to run for reelection. Something resembling the Yankee finance system, which was arranged through the banks, had to be developed. And, what was developed was a patronage system through which the faculties in the public schools, but above all the custodians, financed the election and reelection of the Committee members and enabled their political operations to continue between elections.

This helped to create an urbanized school system. Don't mock this patronage arrangement through which one could purchase a custodial position, or purchase a principalship, or purchase a headmastership. A headmastership sold for as much as $25,000, which is not as high as a taxi medallion in Manhattan. This created a central administration which was responsive to the diverse needs and interests of the neighborhoods which I described earlier. The curriculum was left at first to the neighborhoods. The teachers came up out of those neighborhoods, prepared at the local normal schools, and came back and taught what they had been taught in the neighborhood. They had to pay headquarters in order to get started. This is the beginning of an urban system. This also expresses both the strength and weakness of public urban education. One of the resistances to metropolitanization that is not discussed in the literature is that the patronage arrangements cannot be extended across the whole county, let alone across a greater Boston metropolitan area. Over the generations since World War I, it has become increasingly difficult to sell positions in the system.

The system is also antisuburban. It's not only the antithesis of an urb, but it's antisuburban, as well. Urban-suburban programs have grown up mainly at the devising of the Yankees who have been displaced into the suburbs. These have gone without the support or the sanction of the Boston School Committees and their legions. The program known as METCO is funded by the state legislature. It transports black public school children from Boston to some twenty suburban school districts. There is a Metropolitan Planning Project funded by the federal government, which is intended to stimulate a metropolitan area school system. It is unsupported by the Boston School Committee. EDCO, another collaborative, is unsupported. Decentralized arrangements for collaborations between sub-districts in the city and suburbs are unsupported, indeed opposed, at every juncture by the Committee. In 1976, the School Committee passed a law which required anyone working in the system who received a promotion or a raise, or expected to receive one, to reside in Boston. Now this is a complex issue, but in a small city like Boston with the suburbs within twenty minutes' reach and long since a metropolitan area community, this is a regressive policy in the extreme. That year, the Boston teachers' union prevented the advent of the policy. The courts prevented its implementation, and it was voted in again last spring. The teachers' union is taking it up again.

What did this system create? Well, between 1847 and 1972, the system built 180 school facilities. It not only built them, but true to its antiurban and antisuburban premises, when a

facility was completed, it continued to be used irrespective of the condition of the structure. In 1974, for example, the federal court found that the Chinese-American community was being served by a school called the Quincy School which was the first multi-classroomed structure to be erected in America, dated 1847. Its brick walls were held up by the external rusting fire escapes. This building had found itself ideally located in the very center of Chinatown, and so all Boston Chinese-Americans had had the privilege of going through this innovative structure for 125 years.

From 1942 to 1972, 55 of the 180 facilities were condemned as unfit for school use, as firetraps or as uninhabitable for other reasons, by the city's Public Facilities Commission, by the Boston School Committee itself, or by the State Board of Education. Yet, all 55 were in use through 1974! It took the intervention of the federal court to close 32 of these buildings which had been condemned by their own constructors and maintainers. Some of these are the buildings described in the 1960s in Jonathan Kozol's Death at an Early Age. But still today, this winter, I could take you to buildings where students gather in classrooms where the snow falls freely through the ceiling and the wind blows freely through the uncovered open windows.

Remember, Boston is a poor city. This is a city without a balance between its facilities and its human interests at the outset. This is a city abandoned by the Yankees to the incoming immigrants who lacked the capital to develop it as an industrial center. Thus, each of these facilities was hard won in the first place, and none is given up lightly. Each, by the way, contains a boiler room that has at least two custodians in it who are fundamental to raising the funds for running for reelection to the Committee. And so, either on economic or political grounds, one wouldn't want to close down these structures.

During the 1960s Boston had a rebirth. It began to reconstruct. Its mayor began to imitate former Mayor John Lindsay and to imagine a future for Boston which represented enhanced life chances. A whole series of new school facilities were constructed for the first time since the 1920s. Only one high school built with WPA funding, had been erected since 1934. But Mayor Kevin White projected a series of new schools and began to erect them. As a result some 14 new facilities have come on line since 1965. Many of them are architectural award winners. The state required the city to erect these, not on the basis of the old neighborhoods, but on the basis of population combinations, conditions optimizing ethnic combinations. In 1972, however, even after that spurt of modernization, more than half of the 180 facilities in the system were without principalships.

Remember that it takes time to get up the ante to put it on the barrelhead. It takes time to find the high bidder for appointment. This has been advantageous for the federal court, which has introduced the requirement of a community screening process through which parents, taxpayers, teachers, and school administrators interview applicants in an open procedure, and people are appointed to principalships on other than an acting basis. Every school in the system today--and there are 150 facilities operating--has a principal or a headmaster for the first time since World War I.

The system is now straining toward modernization. Take some of my characteristics of what is urban, and notice their injection into this ruralistic leftover from a previous century. Take occupational education. Until 1975, occupational education was supported by federal monies controlled by the state. If you visited the high schools, you would find the strangest things. In Jamaica Plain, which is ethnically a very mixed community adjacent to Roxbury, the high school contained agriculture and floriculture programs. There each day you could see seventy boys learning to do the mechanical drawings for the construction of pigsties. In the floriculture program no flowers were available, but you could see dried plants being arranged and rearranged. Animal husbandry had been introduced with state funding in 1972. This consisted of one large white rabbit. Students would take turns taking it out of the cage, petting it, weighing it, and feeding it carrots. The band saw in the workshop at Jamaica Plain High, the shop instructor was proud to tell me, had been there for fifty-two years. It was there even before he arrived. And he had--unaided by headquarters--managed to keep that band saw in working use all that time so portions of the pigsties could be constructed each year. The students I interviewed had never seen a pig in a sty. But about half of them had spent two days on a turkey farm during the Thanksgiving vacation.

These were the occupational programs available under the federally funded and state controlled, state inspected auspices. At South Boston High, there is an automotive body repair shop consisting of a single wooden garage outside the high school large enough to contain one Model A Ford, but no lift. Each day, you can find five or six boys rubbing emery paper on the sides of the Model A Ford. So much for occupational education!

In Dorchester, once the seat of cabinet making, upholstering, and wood finishing, once the craftsman neighborhood for the greater Boston area, cabinet makers and carpenters and wood finishers are turned out in abundance, through an excellent program, into a work force that no longer has space for more than perhaps two wood finishers and one upholsterer a year. These are occupations that are dead on their feet.

Occupational education, with the intervention of the federal court, has been reconstructed. Some eighty new occupational training programs have been introduced, and these are shuddering to come into being. By the way, the old system was one in which you were pledged into servitude for three years, that is tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades, and then you couldn't get your diploma until you had worked for a year on a job after your last year in high school. And even then, you could only get your diploma if your employer said you had been a good apprentice. The new occupational education program will enable all interested students, women as well as men, to obtain occupational skills on a part-time basis while also achieving literacy and arithmetic skills.

Let's look at special education. In 1972, there were 4,000 students receiving special services as special education students. By 1975, under the pressure of state law, Chapter 766, this number had expanded to 12,000. Furthermore, every school in the system offered special educational services and facilities where only one school in ten had offered these previously.

Bilingual education has grown within a period of three years from nothing to offerings in seven different languages, including Haitian, French and Cape Verdian Portuguese. The bilingual program has required the hiring of teachers no one has ever seen before. In 1972, about 87 percent of the teachers in the system were native to Boston--Irish-American. By 1976, this had dropped to 75 percent, and it continues to drop annually. It's not possible to hire special educators and bilingual educators out of the ranks of the patronage system in the old white ethnic neighborhoods and still meet state standards.

Most importantly, the system had been designed originally for unequalized opportunity. The force of the court, the force of state pressure, the force of federal intervention has equalized opportunity across the city. This in turn has generated renewed decentralization of programs, the beginnings of linkings of each of the decentralized areas with cooperative programs in adjacent suburbs. Equalization of opportunity has triggered the establishment of collaboration between twenty-three colleges and universities in the public school systems, between twenty-one businesses and industries, between eighty cultural museums and agencies. Parent participation has intensified commensurably.

A move to reform the charter basis of government has been under way for three years and is likely to be crystallized in this coming election year. This is a reform movement which will eliminate at the base the old patronage system and will require elections on a decentralized, representational basis.

I'm just mentioning a few of the forces which are modernizing Boston, breaking an old framework. I must end by mentioning that unionism has some modernizing characteristics as well. Unionism has introduced the notion of contracts, and contractualism itself is part of the complex of modern forms of interaction. Teachers do not have to make individual private money-on-the-barrelhead arrangements directly with patrons on the School Committee anymore. The union contracts have been in operation since 1970. The School Committee violates more than a dozen clauses in its teachers' union contracts each year, and litigation springs up around these violations.

But the entire complex of the city is getting accustomed to the notion that it's possible to develop a contractual relation. Recently, the courts required the School Committee to place twelve principals who had not been given schools that they had requested transfer to in 1973. In other words, under the school administrators' contract, a tenured administrator has the right to request a transfer to a particular school in the event of an open position there and be assured of that position. Twelve of these individuals had been ignored. The State Supreme Court required their placement in the schools they had requested. They will receive those placements, although within three days of the Supreme Court ruling on this four-year-old case, the School Committee deliberated for two hours on whether or not they would obey the State Supreme Court, and furthermore, the Committee examined its options for defying the court ruling, which shows the distance we have yet to go.

Discussion

The question-and-answer session which followed Dr. Dentler's speech centered on teachers' unions, federal intervention in schooling, and the urbanization/modernization of schools and their services.

Questions concerning unionism focused on the problems of competing power structures. Cities such as Boston are still based upon nineteenth-century models, meaning that there is a conflict between patronage systems and the contractual systems which unions represent. The patronage system translates into powerful men who have information networks and loyalties that far exceed the resources of both teachers' unions and, obviously, the populations who are excluded from the network. The union represents relationships and functions that are governed by a negotiated contract between the board of education and the teachers' union. This often boils down to being a problem of the interacting strengths and weaknesses of each type of power structure in an urban

setting. The inevitable conflicts tend to focus attention away from what is educational and toward what are political and economic points of view. A case in point was the contractual right of transfer, which the Boston Board of Education ignored in twelve cases, and which the court finally had to enforce. Another perspective on this, cited by Dr. Dentler, was that the two power systems overlap--that many union members also have an affiliation with the patronage system. This brings the relationship between the Board of Education, the school administrators, and the unions down to a question of how and when contracts are enforced, and what the real issues are when educational questions are discussed between them.

The question of the impact of federal intervention was one which concerned superintendents from Nashville to Newark. While the Nashville situation was considered to be unique, Dr. Dentler and the participants agreed that the impact of busing, of day-to-day direct court intervention, is not yet known. However, politically independent suburbs which are willing to work toward a truly metropolitan school district can forestall federal intervention by engaging in metropolitan programming, said Dr. Dentler. This means collaboration within the metropolitan area instead of squabbling over territorial rights. This requires, however, a vision of a modern, metropolitan city in which all areas and populations are seen as a whole organism. Dr. Dentler suggested that such an urban system would have to be preceded by charter reform and leadership from a school committee and city council that truly represented the constituents of the city. He does not feel it is presently possible to have a truly representative board of education.

The people considered to be against such metropolitanization represent, said Dr. Dentler, such forces as "simple, clear American racism" and resistance to a collaborative effort that would result in comprehensive desegregation. Comprehensive urbanization and modernization would include a better match between the varieties of student needs and school offerings. This translates into special services, occupational education, special education, bilingual education, staff development, etc. A cadre dedicated to pluralism is needed for this to be accomplished.

The last discussion was an attempt to clarify the definition of urb and suburb. One participant observed that what may really be the issue is not race but socioeconomic status. Dr. Dentler said that while SES may be a factor, in the total picture suburbs (substandard parts of the urb) are becoming urbanized. The anti-urban propensity of population types represents a real danger to the creation of a metropolitan community. This antiurban propensity is the concentration of certain populations in sublocalities who then establish permanent enclaves there. The evolution of urban areas is tending to be away from this and toward the urbanization of entire metropolitan complexes.

Urban Education and the Concept of Networks

Seymour B. Sarason

What I have to say will not take long. I think that some aspects of my talk may not set well with you. For that reason, I would like to leave ample time for questions, comments, and disagreements. It is not that I invite them, but I shall respond to them. Perhaps I shall discover that my remarks are less controversial than I think they will be. Incidentally, much of what I have to say today is in my recent book, Human Services and Resource Networks.

Before getting to the concept of networks, I would like to state my perspective and identify several problems. Most of these problems are reflections of the way we think or, more specifically, of what we do not think about, what we take for granted, what we consider right and proper. These are problems that, if not confronted, and even if confronted, make life somewhat more difficult. I want to identify several issues residing in our own thinking which account in part for why the problems are as difficult as they are. The first is that we are not dealing with problems that have solutions. We have, so to speak, been brainwashed into using a natural science concept of solutions. That is, 4 divided by 2 equals 2. That was true yesterday, that is true today, and it is going to be true tomorrow. In the natural sciences one solves the problem and then one goes on to other issues; and to the degree that one solves the problem, one renders part of history obsolete. In fact, the greater your contribution to science, the more you have rendered history in that field obsolete. I suggest that we have never been, and are not, dealing with those kinds of problems in the realm of human action. We have talked as if we are dealing with solvable problems. But, in fact, I think we are not. It is unclear to me how many people believe that there are solutions in the natural science sense, and how many others think this is rhetoric--the kind of thing you have to say in order to appear to be credible and, certainly, in order to get money for what you say you will do in order to achieve a solution.

That is point number one. We are not dealing with problems that have solutions in the natural science sense. So, when a Commissioner of Education comes out and says that this year we are going to solve the reading problem, one does not know whether to laugh or to cry. As Bob Dentler so well described in Boston--and I think that it is generally applicable to every other urban situation--we are dealing with conditions created in history over a long period of time, and they are not problems that are going to be solved in a short period of time, if ever. These problems

will change, and when they have changed, it will be in part because of the way we are defining the problems.

The second issue has to do with something that is obvious, but like so much else in life, we rarely take the obvious seriously. That is, that resources are always limited. We have been operating as if in fact resources are unlimited. This is not the case. We have been hit over the head in that respect. It is unfortunate that there is only one field of inquiry where it is axiomatic that resources are always limited, and I'm talking, of course, about the field of economics. In all other fields, it is as if we never heard of that axiom; or if we heard of it, we didn't want to believe it was true, or we didn't want to face up to its implications. What we are dealing with all the time is what might be called the dialysis problem. As you know, up until a couple of years ago if an individual had kidney disease and needed dialysis as a way of staying alive, he/she stood a pretty good chance if rich, and a not very good chance if poor. Congress finally passed a law so that the federal government now essentially underwrites dialysis for a relatively few people in our society. Now, how can one be against that? And yet, one has to face the fact that there is a question here; that is, when so much is given to so few, what is being taken away from the others? Now I do not raise that question with any suggestion as to how to answer it. What I am saying is that we are always in a situation of limited resources; and to act otherwise is, I think, unethical.

Now a third issue is the way in which we define resources. When you come right down to it, we usually define resources as those things which one can purchase with money. I'm going to suggest that money is not the major problem. We have looked upon money as the solution to our problem--if we had enough and spent enough, the problems would be solved. This is not to say we do not need money. I am not saying that at all. What I am arguing against is the position that says that the reason we are in the mess we're in, and the reason we are never going to get out of this mess is that we are not spending enough money to get out of it. I'm suggesting that this is not the case.

Now, let me come to the concept of networks, and a particular kind of network. First, I want to tell you a story. It's a long story, but I'll make it short. Several years ago, I decided that I wanted to set up in a high school a complete department of psychology--the whole range of courses. I did not want just a course in adjustment, but everything you teach in a department of psychology. I had come to the conclusion that high schools were a major disaster area in our society.

We went around visiting a number of high schools, and in each instance, we met with a good deal of enthusiasm. The source of the enthusiasm was quite clear. They took one look at us and saw that we were a bunch of shrinks, and they had a bunch of kids with attendance problems. If we did set up our program, they would have classes to bring these kids into. We said very clearly that we were not opposed to having these students in our classes, but that this was not the main reason that we were coming in. Nevertheless, they were so enthusiastic that they agreed that I could have graduate students teach in the high school, and, believe it or not, that any Yale undergraduate that I selected could also teach in the program. And you have got to know something about the college-town relationship to know what a concession that was. But what it was telling us, of course, is that they were hurting, and they wanted us in.

This program went on for one year. Please accept my assertion that it was a magnificent experience for everyone concerned. Our students got involved in all kinds of things in the high school. But for very, very personal reasons (namely four dying parents), it was impossible for me to continue with that project, which I shall resume someday.

Now what is the point of the story? The point of the story is that never in a million years would anyone from those schools have approached me and said, "You are a member of this larger community. We have problems. You have resources which we can use. How do we put them together?" I never mentioned money once in my description of this project. We were going to do something that we wanted to do for ourselves, of course with the hope that it would meet certain needs of the people in the school. We approached the school. They never would have approached us. In other words, if one defines resources as that which you can purchase and if you do not have the money, you cannot make the purchase; then the resources might exist, but they are not available to you. I am suggesting that that is far less true than is generally believed. The trick is to figure out--and this is the creative part of it--what basis there is for an exchange of resources without an exchange of money.

That's what our book is about. It's a description of how it started and what it meant and what its possible implications are. There is an underlying value to this kind of network, which we call a barter economy kind of network. And as the word suggests, it is a value that says, "What have you got that I may need, and what have I got that you may need, and what kinds of exchanges can we conceivably make?" I would like to emphasize

the obvious; that is, we are not used to thinking in that way. We are used to thinking in terms of our resources, our money, our budget.

Now there are certain obstacles to thinking differently about resources exchange. One of these is what I call the disease of professionalism, i.e., defining a problem in such a way so as to require only professionals for its solution, and thereby rendering the problem utterly unsolvable. The fact that I heard what I would call anxious laughter in response to my last comment suggests to me that you know perfectly well what the disease of professionalism is. The problem is, how do you get out of the box?

The other obstacle to thinking differently about resources is, of course, tied to the disease of professionalism: that is, the need to feel superior. There is also the weight of tradition. Now, I'd like to close with something which you are going to be dealing with, or are already dealing with. If you are dealing with it, you will appreciate what I'm going to say. Because it's another example of how the same mistakes are being made all over again. I am referring to Federal Law 94142.

It so happens that I have always been one, back over the decades, who fought for mainstreaming. So let me be clear on that point. The mainstreaming concept, insofar as educationally handicapped children are concerned, is in principle no more than a consequence of the 1954 desegregation decision. But leaving that aside for a moment, what 94142 will require is not only more money. The government holds out a carrot to you, that for each child a school will get x amount of dollars, but there are priorities here. And in the long run, and in the not so long run, in fact, it is going to cost the community a good deal of money to fulfill all the requirements of the law. Now I don't know how many of you have read that law, and if you haven't I suggest that you read it in a cool, air-conditioned room.

I mentioned 94142, because it raises again the assumption behind the law that money can solve that problem. It also raises a couple of other assumptions: that we have the resources currently available to solve the problem and that tradition will lie down and die easily, which of course tradition never has done and never will do.

The concept of networks is one that just blossomed in many different fields beginning in the late fifties. It is a very interesting phenomenon. When you go back and review the concept of networks in mathematics, in geography, in sociology, in psychology, and in a wide variety of other fields, you find that

in all these fields, somewhere around the mid-fifties, the concept takes off, so to speak, although one field might not know what the other field is doing, or thinking, which is par for the course. The development of the concept--the idea that this is becoming a highly interconnected, interrelated world--was obviously a derivative of a number of things, not the least of which was World War II and its consequences.

We have not yet, in my opinion, confronted what is meant by an interrelated world insofar as urban education is concerned. My remarks, incidentally, are no less appropriate, I believe, for nonurban education, except that we are hurting a lot more in urban education.

So what I would like to leave with you is the expression, we have met the enemy and it is us. That is, the problem, in part, exists in the way we think, the assumptions we make, what we know, and what we say.

Discussion

Bartering, professionalism, and money were the topics of the discussion session. Superintendents from a variety of school districts were curious to know, in more detail, how exchange networks can circumvent bureaucratic red tape (e.g., certification); how human resources can be exchanged without the problems of volunteerism arising; and how superintendents, who must deal on financial and contractual bases with almost every aspect of education, can introduce such networks into their schools without also introducing the checkbook into the network. Dr. Sarason repeatedly emphasized that resources must be conceived of imaginatively and in terms of mutual benefit. While these exchanges cost all participants something, that cost does not have to be expressed in dollars and cents. "As soon as this thing is put on a financial/contractual basis, you're licked." The key is mutual benefit--a clear understanding of what each party will give and receive through the exchange. The barter economy is powered by self-interest.

Dr. Sarason pointed out that a barter economy maximizes available human resources for mutual "profit"; the very premises upon which volunteerism is based are in opposition to the premises of a barter economy. The idea is to get something that is important to you. The second major point made was that Dr. Sarason operated as an individual, not as a representative of any institution--individual or group initiative, not institutional initiative, is the key element. Individuals as representatives of institutions almost by definition require

bureaucratic involvement in the process of setting up an exchange system.

Educators cannot be expected to cope with the problems they are facing, particularly in urban settings, said Dr. Sarason. The resources are not at hand, and money can no longer be seen as a solution. There is no way out except through the maximized utilization of individual resources in and around the community. We are confronted with problems that cannot be solved in the traditional sense of the word, but he feels they can be redefined. A redefinition of the problems requires a rethinking of them, thus allowing for the development of new understandings of them, new approaches to them, and new considerations of available services. It is essential that we stop thinking of our educational problems in the conventional ways since it is apparent to everyone that conventional solutions are failing. We need to be more creative and show more personal initiative within the scope of community effort.

The example Dr. Sarason gave of how effective a rethinking can be was the World War II effort. Our human resources were evaluated along new lines so that the "problem" of winning the war could be "solved," in part, by a larger work force. Social Security laws were repealed to let older people work, definitions of professional competencies and qualifications were changed to allow more people into previously restricted positions, and women replaced men in the factories. Some people, after a six-week training course, were even put to work as clinical psychologists! This was a time of creative reevaluation of needs and of the resources to meet them. It meant changing old ways of thinking and doing, and it resulted in a positive solution to the problem.

The discussion session ended with questions concerning Dr. Sarason's and Dr. Dentler's conceptions of staff development. Dr. Dentler was asked to return to the podium for this discussion since staff development was of so much concern to the superintendents. Drs. Sarason and Dentler, both skeptical of the value of present approaches to, and conceptualizations of, staff development, feel that it should instead be seen in concrete terms--what teachers and administrators really need in order to perform better. This involves the concept of mutual instruction. The concrete needs that could be addressed in a development program are such things as: how to talk to a parent; how to establish exchange systems within school systems (as well as with outside individuals); and how to negotiate contracts. What is not needed in staff development is the assigning of arbitrary values of "funny money" (e.g., university credits) for classes taken. Instead, the university and school district can develop each other through bartering--a very different concept than that of teachers getting

credits for classes! Dr. Dentler gave as an example a school district and a university that made a list of what each could do for the other. The university could offer the school district eight things. The school district could offer the university eleven. One of the things that neither knew how to do was supervise, so the schools and university pooled their resources to find out together. Out of that will come a staff development program. (Both agreed not to spend any money on the project.) The point is, said Dr. Sarason, we must break the habit of prescribing programs for others and get on with the work of mutual instruction and mutual benefit from an exchange of resources.

The Urban Educator as Politician and Planner

Paul N. Ylvisaker

My purpose in coming today was to check out the competition. I've not, strangely enough, even in my career with the Ford Foundation, set foot on Teachers College property before. With your permission, I've done so today. Also, I wanted to check out how you got some Harvard alumni to enroll in Columbia's sessions.

Let me first share with you something I've shared with many audiences: the origin of a motto that I brought to the Harvard Graduate School of Education from Newark, New Jersey. It has been said that never the twain shall meet, but I have tried to bring the best of both these differing worlds together. My last trip from New Jersey, about five years ago, brought me to the Newark Railroad Station at two o'clock in the morning--a foolish time to arrive there. I'd missed a train and had to wait a long time for another. I passed the time dozing among old tattered newspapers, until I was awakened by a switching crew just off the track. They fell into a desultory discussion and then an argument. I awoke to hear one guy saying to the other--I've emblazoned it now as a motto on Harvard's Graduate School of Education--"I've taught you everything you know, and you don't know nothing."

For a number of years, I was an urbanist. I spent my time being everything from Assistant to the Mayor of Philadelphia to a State Commissioner of New Jersey, during the civil unrest in the late sixties. I've worked in Calcutta as well as a few other urban badlands. That has been most of my life, until I took a strange right-angled turn back into education (having once graduated from a State Teachers College). As an urbanist, I have worried through the problems of America's and the world's cities. I must admit that I went through an exhilarating period in the early sixties, when the affluence of this country gave us promise that we were going to bring everyone at the bottom much closer to the level of everyone at the top. I remained an optimist while a commissioner in New Jersey though I did have a period of great depression during the depths of the racial disputes in Newark, Plainfield, and other communities. At one point, I was absolutely certain that an angry American reaction was going to bring the "final solution" to the black community, particularly in the cities in which I was working. I know in one community, that ugly scenario came close to happening. But my optimism returned in the next two years as I watched a spreading and swiftening sophistication emerge on the streets of every part of New Jersey, particularly in the central cities. I felt at that time we had come across a great divide. Suddenly

urbanized migrants from the agricultural south had become sophisticated and begun to move--courtesy of the poverty program--into positions of influence and leadership, where they could assertively take care of themselves. But depression again set in with the Nixon administration when I watched cynicism replace optimism and constructive idealism.

In other words, I have been battered in the ups and downs of emotions dealing with the urban problems. There are times now when I feel so pessimistic as to become inactive, and that scares me as much as anything. Switching from urbanist to educator has not evened out my mood: I've been watching again, with growing concern, the demoralization of urban educators in these last five or seven years. For some it has been demoralization, and yet, for others--the survivors--there has been an emerging sense of hope as they begin to adapt. Again, some encouragement sets in.

I've deliberately used today as a chance to abstract a bit from the immediacies that tie me to that emotional yo-yo, and in that larger, longer perspective, to look at several major trends throughout the last couple of centuries. During the question period, we can return to the more immediate concerns with which all of us have to cope. Perspective is absolutely essential, and yet perspective is not really enough to handle tomorrow's problems. But if we put together the capacity to cope and the willingness to slug it out, with a perspective that is large enough to provide a sense of direction, maybe we will have a weapon for the future. In other words, we should use these abstractions as a means of placing us in time and easing our passage through the scrambling circumstance of the present.

First, take a look at some trends in human settlement. Incidentally, the study of human settlements has a Greek name now (thanks to a man named Doxiadis) which is ekistics. Doxiadis, a Greek developer, now deceased, was not only a tactician of the moment, but a strategist whose plans were always expressed in the language of history.

In the last two centuries (in this country, and let us limit it to this country for the time being) we've seen settlement patterns that have shifted radically in nature and time--changing in structure and simultaneously experiencing cycles of growth and decline. The most powerful change in structure came with the shift from small to large farms, all the way from the tiny New England stone fields to the homesteads and then the corporate farms and ranches and feeding stations of places in the West. We know that trend: farming has gone as much as

possible toward flat land, in the mode and grip of mass production. It has therefore made obsolete some of the most attractive living places in this country. The mountains and hills of New England, the craggy nooks in the Ozarks and Appalachians, even southern plantations were made economically and socially obsolete. In the process, lots of little people and their amassing offspring were forced off the land. First they went toward concentrated industrial cities. America was changed from an agricultural to an industrial society. And those concentrated settlements--or what remains of them--are now what we call "central cities." They are the lingering, increasingly tattered and forsaken remnants of industrialization and the human settlement patterns that it created--as much by force as by choice.

The dominant trend in our settlement patterns has shifted abruptly toward deconcentration. There isn't a central city left anymore that has the density reached at the high tide of industrialization and immigration from 1900 to 1920. We witnessed first the rush to the suburbs; now--as revealed dramatically by the most recent census, 1970-74--entire metropolitan areas in the older industrial regions are emptying out, their populations heading for places of lower density and smaller scale.

We have moved then from an agricultural to an industrial society, and now at the margin, we are moving to a deconcentrated form of living--at the very time we are creating a service economy, or what has appropriately been called the postindustrial society. Each stage has its own logic--its driving forces. In recent years, we have been trying to evolve a national urban policy, a set of rules and designs that will somehow order these logics and forces more rationally. The major impetus behind these efforts has been the hope that the hardships caused by industrial urbanization could be eased, particularly for those caught in areas of obsolescence: mountain hollows, share-cropping farmlets, central city ghettoes, decaying metropolitan areas. But the driving forces and logics that operate are not easy to go against, especially when minority welfare is one's goal.

We're watching now a Sunbelt peanut farmer begin to do what I did not expect: to press for an urban policy that will benefit the disadvantaged areas and populations of the older industrial communities. The distance that that man has to go is so formidable, both politically and economically, that I cannot be optimistic of his success. An exercise by some developers who compared the cost of constructing the same facility in an eastern and a Sunbelt city will illustrate my point. The eastern cost was double--not counting kickbacks, payoffs, vandalism, or other "environmental extras" so common to older industrial cities. Anyone hoping to

counter the trends I have described will have to deal with those cost differentials and the magnitude of the forces they represent.

Now pause and consider the stage we are in. We are deconcentrating or diffusing our settlement patterns. But these new patterns may not be viable, although I would readily grant they are popular: no one except the young and the rich seem really to want to live in crowded cities. Why not viable? Let me explain why. There is a strain going on. Sprawl has taken us from the central cities to the outer fringe of the metropolitan areas. We are now leaping out beyond that fringe to rural areas and smaller communities. But the economy we are moving into is predominantly a system of services, and services have traditionally depended on achieving critical masses of customers, and critical densities. This is why a New York or a San Francisco does not find an easy substitute in any smaller community, because you cannot get the critical mass necessary to get a theatre going, or the other services which provide the quality of life aspired to by modern cosmopolitans.

The service sector demands these densities. We can to a degree synthesize them by modern methods of transportation and communication. But there are limits to the synthetic. The costs of sprawl are formidable, especially the growing costs of emergy, and sprawl compounds those costs. Logic would demand that within the next twenty-five years we reconcentrate the Americzn population. But logic is one thing, and the vote of a sprawling populace may be quite another. We are probably not capable by a democratic vote in this country of achieving an energy conservation policy that changes our settlement patterns in any substantial, short-run fashion. If we could, we would obviously go back and use some of the obsolete leftover cities that we've begun to decant. In the longer run, things may go differently. Lacking an economical fuel system for a sprawling population, and given a few more price increases by OPEC nations, we may well regather in higher densities. A move in that direction is already apparent among the young. One of their principal clustering points is the urban university neighborhood, with its concentration of cultural services and its tolerance of a lower-income life-style. In this sense, the whole of Boston has become a "univer-city." Young people, not necessarily students, are "enrolling" in Boston.

Another question nagging at the viability of a diffused society is whether we can continue to expand our bureaucratic processes correspondingly. Unless we had developed large-scale managerial systems, we could not have survived industrialization and the large urban concentrations that went with it. Sprawl

has been made possible by individualizing communications and transportation systems--telephone, TV, and automobile. But it has also "distanced" individual units within society, creating a dangerous vacuum between face-to-face and bureaucratized interaction. Schools are struggling in that vacuum, idealizing the individual and operating as a bureaucratic mass. Both Johnny Q. Citizen of the ghetto and Johnny Q. Citizen of the suburb are displaying a deep hostility to the elaboration of the bureaucratic process, whether by adding more personnel or by using more sophisticated computers. The tension created may or may not return us toward more compact (and possibly more communal?) settlements.

Sprawl has also sharpened class differences, by the centrifuge which separates rich and poor geographically. Two cultures are emerging--one of affluence and one of survival. Judging from the reaction against metropolitan desegregation, attempts at joining the two cultures in less sprawled communities may not come to pass. But sprawl still has to face the test of its own viability.

Let us now superimpose educational trends on these human settlement patterns. They follow urban settlement trends, but lag behind, obviously because education emerges only after settlement begins and a constituency of learners develops. Let's trace the correlation from the one room schoolhouse through consolidation. I was shocked by my own lag some time ago, when one of my graduate students took a second look at the school consolidation movement. I remember being one of the advocates of consolidation a generation ago. As a scholar at the University of Minnesota, we got to the bottom line very fast: 120,000 school districts in the United States are too many and too small to be efficient. Now, thirty years later, I was being told by my student that consolidation had been a social and educational disaster. Maybe so, maybe not. But he forced me to see how educational patterns had been set by industrial and urban development: education, too, had gone from isolation to concentration, from the small to the large, and more than that, had sworn loyalty to the values of an industrial society.

So we consolidated. We created large school systems, and we adopted the industrial model of school development. We went into mass production, first at elementary and secondary levels, then in higher education. And the first presidents of those multi-universities or mega-universities achieved heroic stature, just as the large city superintendents before them.

Now, however, we're beginning to sprawl and to pluralize, not only through the suburban school systems in the last twenty years, but by differential delivery systems. Half of postsecondary

courses are now given by business. For instance, if you read an interesting volume just published by the National Conference Board, you'd be startled to see how much of education business really accounts for. Also we've begun to individualize delivery through television and other electronic devices. In this perspective, look at the obsolescence of some of our institutions. Just at the point that we are moving into a pluralizing post-industrial society, we are adopting the industrial pattern of unions and collective bargaining. Some form of representation and negotiated agreements is necessary. But our debates and decisions will suffer if they remain tied to the obsolete concepts of an earlier order. As if our own transitions were not befuddling enough, we will increasingly be involved with the transitions of other nations and cultures. While we move from industrial to postindustrial (service) economy, third-world countries are moving from agricultural to industrial--displacing hundreds of millions of people from the land into cities not yet capable of sustaining more than a fraction of them. Our emptying cities are a powerful magnet for this "surplus" population. Already, that magnet is having its effect. Our rate of immigration is accelerating--400,000 legal and twice that many illegal immigrants. Whether or not our present population reconcentrates, our newer citizens will, exaggerating the geographical class differences noted earlier.

Accelerating migrations from abroad compound the mobility and massiveness of populations which today's and tomorrow's educators must cope with. We are already confounded by the rapidity with which neighborhoods and enrollments change; and we are confounded also by the weight of numbers which adds to the need and difficulty of establishing both personal and group identity. Today's penchant for small and secure communities is not at all difficult to understand, nor is the dilemma of the educators. They are caught between bureaucratized mega-schools and the passion for learning and living environments that are the more painful as the search for the small takes on the character of a retreat--an escape from "the public," as that comes to be identified with what is massive, impersonal, compulsory, and personally dangerous. Urban schools, like deteriorating central cities, are being deserted. And urban architecture takes on the character of a fortress--walled-in megastructures with the dominant motif of security, as in Cleveland Circle, Watergate, new Detroit.

A similar defensiveness is evident in the growing reaction to increased immigration: the KKK is riding again, this time in an attempt to close the Mexican border. President Carter is feeling that pressure. His gesture of declaring amnesty for

illegal immigrants already in the country, but then closing the doors on new immigration from Mexico, is a portent of restrictive moods and measures looming ahead.

Educators are now at the borderline between massing and retreating publics. They also stand between contrasting cultures--between the achievement orientation found in all classes and what can be termed euphemistically the psychology of Robin Hood ("rip-off" is the more plainspoken phrase). Though endemic at all levels of an impersonal, materialistic society, it thrives most easily and conspicuously in the areas of urban obsolescence. Unemployment rates of 40 to 60 percent make recruiting to this counterculture easy among urban youth.

How do you keep kids from becoming cynical when living in this bleak environment, when the world around them in effect disowns them at birth? Kids know when they're not wanted; the lack of jobs is but one indicator. Another is the constant griping about how much it costs to keep schools, welfare, and law enforcement going as though that is all kids mean to a society.

How to reach kids in that environment, and against the odds to keep some sense of hope and legitimate achievement alive is the real challenge facing the urban educator. There is no pat system I know of for preparing educators for that job. Certainly, it defies the usual technology; more certainly, one doesn't succeed in it by the simple act of getting a degree from either Harvard or Columbia. The urban community is no longer waiting on the words or the appointment of an elite corps of technicians. One earns one's way, the hard way, dealing realistically with people whom a turbulent and harshening world has forced to be realistic. Necessarily, the role of educator has shifted from technician to politician, from historian to planner.

I do not demean these roles or the qualities that go with them. I happen to think that the politician by generic trade follows the noblest profession of all. Let me try to indicate how. Let's start simply with the politician as one who has mastered the art of survival. The mayor I once served in Philadelphia, Joe Clark, listed his five governing objectives. Numbers 1, 3, and 5 on that list were to get reelected. In a profession long aloof from politics and secured by tenure, we may have undervalued the art of re-winning our constituency. But not for much longer. If urban educators are to have the staying power needed for their job, they, too, will have to win and re-win the confidence of their citizenry. Going beyond that, politicians have also mastered the art of translation, of listening, and hearing through a dissonance of voices and different languages--hearing what are essential human wants and

needs. Then, having heard, the politician must mediate among conflicting interests--at a minimum keeping people from killing each other, and at the optimum, converting dissonance into harmony and progress. The politician lives in that no man's land, where different cultures meet, and gradually he secures it as a common ground of morals and aspirations.

Another political quality is the art of extemporizing--of "reading" a situation swiftly, sensing that there is no set formula for dealing with it, and then inventing at least a short-run resolution. Like it or not, urban circumstance now and in the future may admit of no longer-run remedies.

Educators will also have to emulate the politician in his role as leader, and often warrior. In these days, the battle for the public's mind is constant and fierce; those who would educate have to be willing to be heard in the public forum, sometimes over a roaring crowd of clashing opinions.

The art of the politician helps master the present; educators must also help create the future. Enter the art of the planner. First, the educator must have the capacity to anticipate. Imagine being at your desk at five o'clock after a weary day and somehow getting your mind on trends that go ten, twenty, or thirty years into the future. The educator must be able to see that a central city is not going to renew itself as a manufacturing hub; understand that the ground rules which state legislatures impose on our central cities will retard the emergence of the service economy--reliance on property taxes placing mayors unwillingly at odds with nonprofit institutions that provide services and jobs but not rateables. The educator must also be able to foresee that Hispanic-Americans will soon be the nation's largest minority, that central cities may well be repopulated with uncounted immigrants from the Third World. He/she must determine in advance to be prepared for such contingencies, if only by spreading awareness of their possibility and stretching the minds of his/her professional colleagues.

A planner is one who also organizes and structures so that the meaningless jumble of things becomes coherent. That skill is now at a premium--though the contemporary scene with its paradox and disorder may be beyond all but Kafka's explication.

Finally, there is the planner's art of setting goals and then bending contrary forces in desired directions. Given the magnitude of those contrary forces and the lesser powers at our command, that art is most aptly described as social jujitsu.

Now who is to train these politician-planner-educators, and how? I am not sure to what degree the Harvards and the Columbias will actually be asked to produce this next generation of urban educators. More than likely, they will emerge on their own, indigenous to the communities they serve. Thankfully, the graduate at Harvard has become a way station for the self-development of increasing numbers of urban educators who have emerged from, and are determined to serve, urban and minority communities--black, Native American, and Hispanic, and Third-World educators who together constitute almost a third of our student population.

To the extent we do participate in the training of tomorrow's urban educators, we will have to broaden and diversify our curriculum; broaden it to develop the political and planning arts; and diversify it, in recognition that urban education will exploit and take place in an expanding variety of institutions and settings--libraries, museums, television, radio, encounter groups, church groups, corporations, unions, support groups, families. Urban education will also require a corresponding diversity of educational roles. We will have to train versatile and entrepreneurial educators who can work successively and sometimes simultaneously in a variety of settings and who can fashion careers out of discontinuous job opportunities.

Because longevity in urban education will be achieved through a series of employments, life in any one job is likely to be short. Training will have to be continuous: give up the notion of getting that Ed.D. and then forever staying out of school. Training will also be more experiential--certainly in closer touch with the urban community and its own continuous growth and change. It will have to be heavily cross-cultural, with direct exposure to differing communities and their interaction, even where violent. More than anything, the preparation of urban education should be psychological--accepting stress as an inescapable fact of professional life. I would screen urban educators carefully for their capacity to handle stress, just as we learned after fatal experience in the sixties to screen police officers for their ability to stay cool under the fire of civil disturbance.

Since ours is an age of negotiated consent, urban educators also need training in that art--whether the negotiations be with teachers, unions, legislative bodies, or community groups. That art is only partly a mastery of technique. It is even more a mastery of one's self and the ability to withstand the weariness that comes with protracted argument and political manipulation.

Finally, the training of urban educators should be judged by its success in developing creativity, both on the job and in those

whom they teach. There are no known solutions to the current and coming problems of our changing urban society, other than the creative capacity and response of those who must cope with it.

It's in that perspective--in that hope--that I've been sorting through the training program for educators at Harvard. And now you can understand why I've come to check out the competition at Columbia and to test my own thinking against yours. At best, we've defined the problem and recognized we're a long way from having all the answers.

Discussion

The changing role of the superintendent was the focus of the discussion following Dr. Ylvisaker's talk. The first set of questions was about the mobility of urban superintendents and the impact this has on program development. Dr. Ylvisaker said that superintendents must be realistic when assessing the time they will have to complete their agenda--the tenure of most superintendents is now only three to five years. This being the case, it is essential that they perfect their working environment so that it can continue to work for change and priority projects even after the superintendent has moved on. A good carry-over staff must be created. A superintendent must decide what it is he wants to do and then try to do it in the shortest possible amount of time. In addition, a superintendent who is negotiating for a new position should insist on being able to bring at least one or two of his or her own people along. These people provide immediate emotional support, can be trusted, and can begin work as part of an administrative team well before the superintendent has established a working relationship with the rest of the staff.

The responsibilities of superintendents are also in a state of change. As boards of trustees and boards of education find that they can be held legally responsible for educational practices in their districts, they are beginning to actively assert themselves in every aspect of schooling. This means the supervisor must become a negotiator, must combine some of the qualities of the politician with the qualities of an educator. It means that the superintendent must have the support of that legislative body. Yet one interesting outcome of this is that the boards are beginning to hire their own staff so that they have their own independent sources of information; this obviously creates tension between staffs--the boards' and the supervisors' staffs. In Dr. Ylvisaker's opinion, today's most successful supervisors have

somehow been able to keep a coalition or support group going in their board or legislative body. It is extremely important that the superintendent be working toward complementing instead of competing with the school board.

Several other questions concerning the emerging role of the superintendent were raised, and they reflected concern with the politicization of the superintendent on the one hand, and the growing need for specialized business skills on the other. Dr. Ylvisaker envisions a new role which will develop along the lines of the city managers who, ten or fifteen years ago, left the "industrial model" and moved toward a "political model." Surviving as a superintendent requires, he said, a political artfulness in order to stay on top when so many frictions in the community can pull you down. Modern superintendents must begin to move down toward the principals while at the same time moving up toward the boards. They must begin to decentralize the system in larger districts in order to give principals a sense of power and a sense of being able to create their own environments; at the same time, he or she must be able to work constructively with boards, school committees, or whatever. The superintendent must also have political savvy in the positive sense of the word. He/she must be able to bring groups together, to find the common human aspirations that may be hidden by the rhetoric of militant leaders. He/she must be able to stand outside of the confrontational process of what are often over-politicized groups.

In addition, the superintendent must stay on top of developments in technology--modern methods of storing and transferring information and knowledge make present educational practices old-fashioned. Similarly, new patterns of schooling are developing, and more and more people are engaging in recurrent learning every year. These developments must be watched and planned for if schooling is to keep pace with society's educational needs.

The last question raised the issue of control: Have superintendents lost their control of educational programs since so much legislation has been passed on every phase of program development and implementation? Dr. Ylvisaker feels quite the contrary. There are so many laws that it is impossible to enforce them; so, like the police, superintendents can begin to enforce their own regulations and the official ones they feel are pertinent to their needs. It really, in practice, offers great freedom of choice because it is impossible to do anything except choose or create what is appropriate.

The Management of Urban Education

Bernard R. Gifford

I am going to try out some ideas on you today. For the last four years I have worked as Deputy Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools, the second highest position in the school system. My time in that position coincided with a period of unprecedented cutbacks. These cutbacks exceeded even those which took place in the 1930s, during the deepest period of the Depression. During my tenure as Deputy Chancellor the schools were also undergoing a period of great adjustment and change. The adjustment had to do with trying to live with the decentralization law which, I need not remind those of you who have followed the disputes over school governments, grew out of the great racial confrontations of the early and late 1960s.

I might also point out now that I am in the process of trying to ferret out some of my own thoughts because I've been given an opportunity by the New York Times to do a series of "Op-Ed" pieces on education. I've been playing with some themes that I would like to try out on you.

In discussing urban education management, I ought to tell you to what population I'm addressing my remarks. I'm sure that what I will say will have little relevance for those of you who are in small school districts, in particular those of you who are in school districts that are predominantly white. I am addressing myself to the problem of operating in a large, urban school district, such as Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco, St. Louis, or Detroit. I think that these school districts are unique; they do have a particular set of problems, which they will be forced to confront over the next few years. What are some of the problems and what are some of the issues?

One of the main discoveries that I made in four years of being inside 110 Livingston, and watching the city of New York go through its fiscal trauma, is that we know absolutely nothing in government, be it schools or in general government, about allocating scarcity. We simply do not have a technology of cutting back. It sounds almost naive, it sounds almost silly, but I can tell you from first-hand experience, that we simply do not have a technology. The problem is especially acute for those who came to maturity during the 1960s when most of the debates occurred around the issue of how one allocated the new resources which were being made available by the federal and state governments. In that period, when faced with major cutbacks, as we were in New York City--cutbacks which forced us

over a two-year period to pare our staff by more than 23 percent, something close to 16,500 teachers--we found that we simply did not have the technology for allocating scarcity. I remember during the early stages of the fiscal crisis the reactions of the administrators when I called them in and said we were going to be facing a 15 percent budget cut. They went around me. They went to the Chancellor; they went to the Board; they engaged in all kinds of political shenanigans, not because they were evil, but because they thought that this was just another in the series of fiscal crises that New York City had grown used to over the past ten to fifteen years--crises which started with prophecies of doom and usually ended up with either no change or a very small increment in growth.

We simply do not have an ideology, an understanding, or an appreciation of what it means to make cuts. The result is that in New York City, at least for the first year, we suffered through this leakage of reality, this incapacity to understand that the cuts were real and that we would not be facing a restoration in a short period of time. Only in the last year have we reached the point where people are willing to make the cuts.

Let me give you an example. When we were going through our sessions and making the budget cuts, I introduced the notion of zero-based budgeting. I called it priority budgeting. I placed the emphasis on priority budgeting because I wanted the high-level executives in the school system to decide for themselves which programs should have the highest priority when making allocations or cuts. Do you know what most people did? They took all the programs that they wanted to protect and made them number one priority. As for the programs that were most popular and had the most constituency, these they assigned the last priority. In the case of special education--and I hope that I am not telling tales out of school--the executive director placed last on her list of priorities schools for pregnant girls, drug centers, and other programs sure to maximize the squeal from the politicians when cut. I remember going over the cuts with her. I kept on saying "Are you really saying that this is the last order of priority? You cannot make cuts in other areas?" And she kept on saying, "Yes, yes." I went to the Board of Education and said that this was a challenge that we had to accept, and so we made those cuts. And God, it was hell. But we had to do it in order to bring about a sense of discipline in the school system. I think that this last year, in going through this exercise, we saw for the first time--probably for the first time in the history of the school system--an order of priorities that made some sense. To my colleagues who are in other large urban school systems, it is difficult to tell you how to get prepared for scarcity, but I

would say to you that in the future, you will be increasingly faced with the problems of allocating scarcity.

A second problem, and one which probably struck me more as an outsider than it would those of you who have worked in the vineyards for a long period of time, is the persistent feeling of failure that I discovered among so many of the people in the public schools. It is something corrosive. I have spent an enormous amount of time with school principals, and there is no doubt in my mind that in terms of morale, in terms of expectations, in terms of job satisfaction, the urban school system is increasingly becoming a place where it is very difficult to maintain any of these at a high level.

The third observation I'd like to make of the urban school system is that it had better be prepared for an unprecedented attack on its legitimacy as the organization given the power by the state to exercise monopolistic control over mass education. You may recall the struggles of the 1950s when the Catholic church in this country, and particularly in New York State, made one of its more concerted efforts to get public resources for private and parochial schools. Over the next five to ten years, we are going to see a new kind of coalition coming together in our large cities--a coalition that is going to have far more power than the Catholic church had. This coalition will be questioning whether or not public schools should continue to have faith placed in them, in the form of monopolistic control over mass education. In New York, and I'm sure that one can think of parallels in other cities, one can foresee a coalition of Catholics, Hispanics, disaffected middle-class blacks, Orthodox Jews, and some conservative whites coming together and forming a critical mass and questioning, maybe beyond the point of redemption, the legitimacy of the long-held notion in American history and American education that the public schools do indeed deserve to exercise monopolistic control over mass education.

Obviously, there are going to be reactions to some of these trends. Paul Ylvisaker talked about how boards of education are changing. Having worked with the New York City Board of Education for the last four years, I can tell you, I have seen the future. While not commenting on whether or not it works, let me say that superintendents in urban school systems will find it more and more difficult working with boards of education. Since most boards of education are political organizations, they will be responding to the problems that accompany the allocation of scarcity and the pervasive feeling of failure. This whole question of legitimacy will be debated, and we can expect that more and more boards of education will be confused as to what role they ought to take--

whether or not they should be an administrating or a policy-making group. One can expect that this will be an area, though not understood by the mass of people, that will be contested greatly by those in the educational community. In New York City, we have a full-time, or what I call a professional board of education, and we are now in the process of debating whether or not this is a model worth maintaining.

Another problem that those of us in urban school systems will have to live with, it is becoming increasingly clear, is that for a long time we will be serving a constituency that has little political power. Let me give you an example. During the budget cutbacks in New York City, the Board of Education suffered cuts far out of proportion to those made in other basic municipal services. In fact, the ratio was about two to one. While the Board of Education was cut more than 22 percent, other municipal services received cuts of about 11 percent. Someone came to me and said "Why is this so? Why aren't people protesting?" I told him it was very easy to understand if you take a look at the politics. By way of explanation, I would like to go through an exercise with you using New York City as an example. It's an exercise that can be applied to other cities as well. Let's assume that we have 7.5 million people in New York City. Let us also assume that we have 2 million people under the age of eighteen, which leaves us 5 million adults. About 3 million of those adults are registered voters. They are our population bowl of decision makers. Now let's take a look at the scope. People said to us, if there are 1 million children in the school system, it would seem that any cutback in services would be political suicide for those doing the cuts. If you figure on the average of two public-school children per family, which is probably exceptionally low, and if you take into account that large numbers of our children come from families with only one parent in the home, you have, at the most, 700,000 parents. Thus, of the 3 million adults, only 700,000 are parents.

Many of the parents of the public-school children in New York and in Detroit, Philadelphia, and Chicago are minority parents; and the voting participation rate of minorities is far less than that of the general population. One must also take into account that the minority population tends to be much younger than the majority population. All of a sudden you realize that the constituency of public education might be no more than 300,000 out of 3 million. These numbers can be repeated again in virtually every major urban area in the country.

Now, compare the numbers: 300,000 to 400,000 voters who have a direct interest in public education because they have children in the public schools against, perhaps, 2.7 million votes that can be

threatened by police action or an emergency in the area of sanitation, power, or fire. Everyone is a potential victim of a mugger; everyone is a potential victim of a natural disaster, while only a handful of people are potential victims, or feel they are potential victims, of an unnatural disaster hitting the schools in the form of disproportionate cutbacks.

There are some other things that I think that we might look at in the future in terms of the problems facing the urban school manager, and one of these is the role of litigation. Paul Ylvisaker alluded to this in his presentation. I've had to live with litigation in ways that I did not expect when coming to the school system. I think that in urban school management, if superintendents are going to be successful in the future, they will need to have a firm grounding in the law. Over the next five to ten years for example, we can expect increasing litigation in the following areas: school finance, special education, and educational malpractice lawsuits. We have already had a number of states that have faced major constitutional crises in the area of school finance, e.g., California, in the Serrano decision, and New Jersey, in the Cahill decision. Connecticut has just reached a threshold in the beginning of its constitutional crisis, in a case called Horton v. Mescel; and in New York State, we are now in the process of going through a litigation called Levittown v. Nyquist, which promises to bring this state to its knees sometime in 1979 or early 1980. These are all school finance cases, but I think that we are going to see similar crises evolve in virtually every major state which houses one of our candidate school systems. Recently I heard that in Cincinnati the board of education filed a lawsuit against the State of Ohio, claiming that the current aid to education formula discriminates on the grounds that it ignores the fact of municipal overburden and the special educational needs of children in urban schools.

We can also expect to see increasing litigation in the area of special education--a problem as moral as it is educational--and something that we have tussled with in the New York City school system. In a period in which we have been forced to cut our staff back more than 22 percent, we have also been reallocating resources and putting these into special education. In New York City, the problem becomes acute, because we are such a large city that we have a variety of handicaps. For example, within five blocks of here, we have a center for multiply handicapped children. The average expenditure per pupil, per year in that center is approximately $14,500. We receive in State Aid less than $3,000 a year, so we are spending $11,000 a year out of city taxes, city tax levy funds, and other funds. It raises

profound moral questions within the manager's gut as to whether or not one ought to continue to put money in an area where the return on the investment (it sounds so cruel to say that) is going to be marginal at best. Perhaps the $11,000 would be better spent on a remedial reading teacher who would provide services for thirty people throughout a year. But be that as it may, one can predict with a fair amount of accuracy that those involved in urban education will find themselves more and more, like New York City, under a judicial gun to increase offerings in the area of special education, even in the face of cutbacks in other areas.

A third area, which is beginning to make its way through the educational community, and in which I suspect we are going to see some major litigation soon is that of educational malpractice lawsuits. A theory is evolving in the legal literature. There have been a number of feeble attempts, but so far, no major attempts have been made to file a lawsuit in this area. I think the recent Supreme Court decisions, such as the one out of Detroit where the Supreme Court upheld the right of a Court of Appeals to order a state to spend extra money on students that have been damaged as a result of past school segregation, will lend momentum to the efforts to file educational malpractice suits. One can foresee during the next four or five years the courts grappling with notions of equality and equity within the context of trying to resolve an educational malpractice lawsuit.

For example, how would one define equal educational opportunity in the context of an educational malpractice suit? Are we talking about equal dollars per student? Well, if we are, it would be disastrous for most minority students, because it turns out in most of the cities I know--especially when one takes into account Title I expenditures--minority students have more money spent on them than nonminority, nonneedy students. Are we talking about compensatory equality that is a basic per capita allocation, plus an additional sum of money? Well, if that is what we are talking about, how do you quantify the additional sum? And then there is a third element in equal educational opportunity, and that is outputs. What must one do to guarantee that the distribution of failure and success among disadvantaged pupils is going to coincide with that of nondisadvantaged pupils? The questions that we have been grappling with for years in education and urban administration, the courts will probably be confronting over the next five years; and a number of urban administrators will continue to grapple with these questions as defendants in lawsuits.

Probably one of the most important issues we are going to have to address ourselves to--an issue that I have had to deal with in many ways and I feel terribly uncomfortable discussing publicly but am convinced has got to be talked about intelligently again--

is the problem of race. Race in education, race in our cities--it is a problem that we have not resolved. We simply do not know where we are headed. And if you go back over some of the issues that I have talked about, you will find that underlying many of them is the problem of race. To talk about race, it is necessary to go back to the landmark decision of 1964. Congress then passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which became effective in 1965. The most important effect of that act was that it moved this country away from official racism and into a period of racialism.

Let me make a distinction between the two terms. I have always defined racism as a set of practices supported by a theology, a political philosophy, or an intellectual body of data or beliefs. For example, a given group is said to be inferior because of certain logical, unassailable reasons. A good example of racism is of course the kind propagated by Adolph Hitler. Racialism is a little bit different. In a racialistic society, there is no underlying theology of racial inferiority. At least there is not a publicly proclaimed theology or philosophy. What there is, is a set of practices. The Civil Rights Act, then, was important in that it moved us off the dime. We ceased to be, at least in legal terms, a racist society; we moved into racialism. This is an important distinction and one which has generated tremendous difficulty for those involved in civil rights activities. When the villain was racism, we had a very easy target. If racism took the form of laws which mandated the segregation of pupils, all we had to do was go after those laws, or those practices. If racism took the form of an official denial of job opportunities, or educational opportunities, especially in professional schools, there, too, we had a target. But what happens when the society shifts from racism to racialism? There are no specified targets, and it is very difficult to go after patterns and practices.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act, in addition to taking us from racism to racialism, had another goal which was to move us toward a society where race was simply irrelevant. One remembers the Martin Luther King speech made during the march on Washington when he talked about the day when people would be judged by their character, and not by the color of their skin. And yet we find ourselves, in 1977, involved in one of the most difficult moral and political issues we have ever had to deal with as a nation, and that is the issue of compensatory justice. The vehicle for that debate, of course, is the Bakke case. It grew out of the special admissions program at the University of California Medical School at Davis where the university, in order to compensate for past discrimination against black applicants to medical schools, set aside sixteen positions. There was no doubt about it; it was a quota system. That system is now being

challenged, and it is raising all kinds of questions about compensatory justice and the role of race in American society.

In our schools--in urban schools--we are going to see over the next ten, twenty, or thirty years a transition, probably as important as any transition that has taken place with race relations in this country; and that is a transition, not only in pupil population, but in power relations within the educational community. In the next ten, twenty, or thirty years, the black administrator and the Hispanic administrator will not be the rare event that they are now. They will probably constitute the majority of urban administrators. And because they will be occupying essential positions in terms of their access to the press, they will be able to set the agenda for American education. It should be interesting, to say the least, to see how the educational community responds to an image of a profession which has lots of blacks in a leadership role. Probably no profession in American society has ever gone through this sort of transition, and it remains to be seen whether or not we are big enough in this country to watch this transition take place and to live with the implications of it. We must see that we do not revert back to a pre-1964 way of thinking in trying to resolve the dilemmas of large numbers of blacks and other minorities in the role of principal spokespersons for American education.

The whole area of race in education is something which these new black administrators will have to deal with. What has vexed black intellectuals for many years is the question of class and race within the black community. One of the defensive methods that blacks developed during the 1960s, as part of the crusade to push the country in the proper direction in the area of civil rights, was to deny the existence of class differences among blacks for fear that it would provide an easy cop-out for those attempting to scuttle civil rights bills, or bills aimed at redressing social injustices.

I think that we are entering a period in our history where black intellectuals and blacks in leadership are secure enough, though it may be a false security, to talk about class distinctions within the black community. Also for the first time, these same black intellectuals and leaders are able to state publicly that some of the problems that are currently plaguing the cities, and particularly the black community, require a generation or two to solve. I even have great difficulty in saying that, because I know how often in the past people have used the same expression as a cop-out for doing nothing. One would hope that as we become more secure in our alleged leadership, we will be able to make these distinctions.

It is interesting, for example, that during the recent blackout in New York City some of the more pungent criticism of the rioting came not from the traditional white Babbitts, but from within the black community. I can say with a high degree of certainty that those kinds of criticism, and especially the kinds of adjectives used in describing the behaviors of those that looted this city in a period of great trauma, would not have been made by blacks ten years ago. The fear would have been that had these criticisms been made, all blacks would have been classified as bootleggers or Toms. I won't say that I agree with all the comments that were made, but the fact that they were made did, I think, manifest a new stage of growth and development in the life of our cities.

To sum up, the problem of race is a problem that underlies all the other issues. The major issues that urban managers in public schools will have to be concerned with over the next five to ten years are (1) the allocation of scarcity; (2) dealing with the byproducts of the persistent feelings of failure, which I think has become more and more characteristic of professionals working in large city school systems; (3) the problem of legitimacy; (4) the changing roles of the boards of education; (5) the politics of education, the distortion between those in public schools and those that make the political decisions at the polls; and (6) the whole new area of litigation around school finance, special education, and educational malpractice lawsuits. That is how I see the future, but, like most prognosticators, I do not wish to be held accountable for anything I have said!

Discussion

The majority of the discussion centered on Dr. Gifford's view of contemporary trends in education, especially in the area of managerial skills and budgeting during a time of financial crisis. The first trend, said Dr. Gifford, is toward hiring managers to work with educators in the supervision of urban school systems. Most educators do not have the managerial skills that are necessary to meet the demands of a large system--it is not fair to expect the chief educational officer to also be the chief managerial officer. More and more school boards are hiring urban managers, who are not trained as educators, to enter their school systems in number two positions. Nevertheless, superintendents need to know accounting and budgeting as part of their basic skills. Dr. Gifford advises his students who want to be superintendents to get an M.B.A. degree before, or in addition to, a doctorate in educational administration.

The major problem confronting supervisors when it comes to managing their resources is that most were trained to budget for incremental growth not for dismantling or eliminating programs. However, what is needed today is the ability to make cutbacks. Because we tend to operate in an incremental budgeting system, said Dr. Gifford, most superintendents and managers focus their attention on the programs and agencies that are at the margin of the system. They tend to think, "If I have to make a cut, I might have to cut back on special education or bilingual education." We are not used to facing the prospects of cutting back 10 to 15 percent in every area. When cutbacks in every area are required, Dr. Gifford suggested that the superintendent engage in a priority-budgeting process in order to prepare for a reallocation of resources. This is not zero-based budgeting, which is extremely difficult to impose on the public sector. (Dr. Gifford invited the superintendents to write the New York City Board of Education for materials on priority budgeting.) Basically, priority budgeting forces administrators to detail and to justify what they are doing. Starting at the bottom, you ask people what they are responsible for and how they can associate that with resources. You then ask them to rank their activities in terms of importance, indicating what is required by law, tradition, etc. Next you have lower management people order their priorities and make middle management people do the same. These priorities are added to the list; and by the time you get to the top person, you can understand why activities are ranked in a certain way. Then, it is possible to ask these people the questions you are not able to ask when using a traditional line-item budget.

Administrators have cried wolf too many times--people are skeptical when the topic of fiscal crisis is raised. When people rank programs to be cut according to political considerations (i.e., when they think the public outcry will force the board and supervisors to back down), you have to be prepared to make them cut exactly what they say their lowest priority items are. Making people understand that a cutback is a reality is one of the toughest parts of budgeting in a time of financial trouble.

The second major trend, said Dr. Gifford, is the increasing mobility of superintendents, a subject most of the speakers have addressed during this conference. Dr. Gifford advised the superintendents to plan for high mobility and to include two important items related to it in their contracts. First, they should insist on a portable pension plan so that it can go with them when they move on. Second, they should insist on sabbatical days, accrued on a yearly basis, in addition to accruable vacation days, so that at the end of five years they have about five or six months accrued. This gives them time to think about what they are going to do next without suffering a tremendous loss of income.

The next area of discussion was the subject of teachers' unions and the role of Mr. Shanker in the future of education. Dr. Gifford sees increasing cooperation between union management and the community because the public as a whole no longer really cares about education. As a campaign issue, education is currently placed fifth, sixth, or seventh in the polls in New York City. Dr. Gifford attributes this to the massive withdrawal of children of influential people from the public schools. The school system is now serving a largely powerless constituency (powerless because they don't vote in the same proportion as the middle class). There is no point in the teachers' union trying to generate support for a particular policy, because public interest just isn't there. This means that people are no longer able to build a political career on the back of public education. Back in 1969 someone like Mr. Shanker probably could have been elected mayor of New York City. However, the constituency is no longer there. Secondly, Mr. Shanker's union is rapidly becoming "majority-minority." For example, Mr. Shanker has had to lower his rhetorical guns on the issue of race, because it is now counterproductive. He can read demographic trends; in the long run, he will have to become part of a coalition. Third, Mr. Shanker lost a tremendous amount of prestige during the New York City cutbacks. Teachers around the country saw what was happening and concluded that Shanker couldn't even protect his own people, much less a national union.

The last area of discussion concerned reorganization of school systems after priority budgeting and cutbacks have been made. Dr. Gifford said that priority budgeting and reorganization produced so many sources of information that the New York City Board of Education was able to both understand what was actually happening and to look at that information from a number of perspectives. For the first time, for example, they were able to learn who had borrowed staff members from other bureaus and agencies, to develop a long-term record as to what organizations and bureaus had grown at the fastest rate over the last five years--and to ask some very serious questions to determine why. Dr. Gifford suggested that he could now, based on his experience in New York, go into any school system in the country and make an overall reduction in resources of 10 to 15 percent.

Administrators in New York City had been making decisions without having real information (the allocation formula had been a sham, etc.), so Dr. Gifford and a few others, working as managers, began introducing information into the system. When they introduced concrete information, they also introduced a level of confusion that made many people uncomfortable. Yet by introducing the information that was needed for sound decision making, they took the mystery out of it and, in the long run, opened the decision-making process to a greater number of people.

Alternative Models for Urban Education

Wilson Riles

I'm pleased to have the opportunity to lead off this morning's discussion of urbanicity and urban education. I realize, as I look about this distinguished group, that being first can be a hazard as well as an opportunity. I'm certain that not everyone here will agree with all that I have to say. That is precisely the value of this meeting. As we pool our perceptions of the problems of urban education and our conceptions of solutions, we will find ways to educate each member of the urban community--rich, poor, minority or majority, gifted, handicapped, or average.

I have purposely used the word ways because the thrust of what I have to say this morning deals with alternative models for urban education.

In California, we have nothing else but diversity, so my interest in alternative models is slightly more than academic. In our urban areas, there is no homogeneity. For example, a single district, Los Angeles Unified, covers the barrios of Latin population, the middle-class tract homes of a dozen diverse ethnic and racial groups, the estates of the very wealthy, and the blighted sprawl of obsolescent and decaying neighborhoods occupied by the poor of many cultures. Of necessity, we must think in terms of alternatives.

Who can say that there is only one way to educate the urban population? Who can say to the youngsters of San Diego, Los Angeles, Oakland, or San Francisco--for all of our urban centers are equally diverse--"fit the system or fail?" I cannot and I must not.

California schools, as schools everywhere, have evolved out of the needs of society and the individual within society. Over the past two centuries in America, education has been remarkably able to meet the needs of a changing society. When this was an agricultural nation just beginning to develop a democratic form of government, our schools provided citizens armed with basic skills and basic love of country. As we proceeded into the industrial age, our schools provided men and women capable of manning the mills and mines, and providing the muscle to build the railroads and the urban concentrations which followed. But the unparalleled and tumultuous changes that have taken place in American society and in the character of American youth in the last thirty years are presenting public education with a new and bewildering set of challenges. Nowhere is this more evident than in the urban

areas. Our cities, the nurseries of civilization, are also the hothouses of social problems--broken homes, alcoholism, suicide, crime, drug abuse, child abuse, venereal disease. Every form of political and social dissidence thrives in the warmth of urban concentration.

Let me give you a list of problems of urban education as compiled by Hugh J. Scott who was superintendent of the Washington, D.C., schools--and that was is typical of descriptions of big city superintendents. They don't last long. Writing in the December 1976 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, Scott said, "No one can formulate a truly comprehensive list of the contradictions, conflicts and calamities that a large city superintendent must contend with. Nevertheless, I shall offer a few . . . ." Scott's list has eight points.

1. The urban centers of the major United States cities nearly always exemplify the negative consequences of social disorganization and deterioration.

2. The children who are the easiest and the least expensive to educate have fled.

3. Schools do not have the resources, the power, or the knowledge to rescue children from the lower socioeconomic levels.

4. Performance accountability for school administrators and teachers in such an environment is unrealistic.

5. Board/superintendent relations are ill defined and lead to irreconcilable conflicts and confrontations.

6. Too frequently, judgments of the performance of superintendents derive from the particular frustrations, concerns, ambitions, and biases of individual members of the board.

7. The very views and programs which generate support for a superintendent from his school board at a given time are commonly cited later as reasons for his dismissal.

8. The urban superintendent is expected to respond directly to a great diversity of individuals and groups. To hold his position, Scott concluded, he must become a consummate politician, i.e., liar.

Scott's list reminds me of a story about James Thurber. Thurber and his friend attended the opening of a play which proved a disaster from beginning to end. As they left the

theater, the friend said, "That was the dreariest, dullest, and shoddiest play I ever saw." This off his chest, he turned to Thurber and asked what he thought of the play. "Well," Thurber replied, "I didn't think it was that good." After hearing Scott's description of the plight of the big city superintendent, I imagine some of you are saying to yourselves, "I didn't think it was that good."

Well, perhaps today we can offset some of the pessimism and see what Theodore Reller, a professor of education at the University of California at Berkeley, envisions as a new ability of urban schools to achieve a "golden age." Because core cities represent such a challenge, Reller says in his book, Educational Administration in Metropolitan Areas, they will be the place to overcome problems affecting all of education. "Here we have the resources such as a diversity of cultures, highly educated person power, universities," Reller writes. "Here are the crises out of which learning may take place . . . . Here we have the beginnings of a search for new or different values." When you add to Reller's list all the other cultural benefits of the urban scene--live theater, museums, galleries, concerts, opportunities for student internships in city, county, and federal agencies, in hospitals, retirement homes, and child-care centers, in a wide range of institutions, professions, and industries--then you begin to see the unlimited possibilities of alternative models of education within the context of the learning environment, within the city itself.

Of course poverty, anomie, centralization of governance, and all the other ills of urban education exist. But just as certainly, the benfits are there as well, if we but break out of conventional and traditional modes of educating the young.

In California, in all our schools--urban, suburban, and rural--we are undertaking reform which is a two-pronged attack on the problems of education in the seventies. We are focusing on the needs of the individual rather than on the needs of the system, and we are moving the locus of decision making from a central office downtown to the school-site level and bringing the neighborhood community into the process. If you are going to change anything in education effectively, that change has to occur where the real action occurs--where the child is. That does not necessarily mean in the classroom, but it does mean where the child is learning.

Our reform of early childhood education requires that parents and teachers plan together at the school-site level to meet the needs of the youngsters in that school. Those plans reflect the cultural values of the community in which the child exists; those

plans address the needs of youngsters in the context of their environment. Our Early Childhood Education Program has almost as many alternative models of education as there are schools. No two are identical. Some stress basic skills, some stress affective learning, some stress health and motor skills--whatever best meets the needs of those youngsters in the school. But all have one thing in common, whatever the emphasis, the teaching-learning process is geared to the individual child. Early Childhood Education schools have been a reality in California for four years, and the program has made a substantial difference in both governance and in learning. Parents are not frustrated by layers of bureaucratic superstructure. Decentralization has taken the heat off the board and the superintendent. Money is allocated to the school, and the parents have a voice in deciding how it should be spent. Teachers, parents, and school-site administrators are partners--not adversaries. Each child is learning at his/her own pace. The system fits the child so that he/she is not forced to fail because of some arbitrary standard or methodology adopted by strangers.

As important as reform is at the early childhood, primary level, it is equally, if not more important, at the intermediate and secondary levels. The foundation established in the early years is eroded if the system is not reformed beyond the third grade. It is absolutely essential that we have an intermediate and secondary system which is relevant to modern society. That system must provide alternative learning environments, curricular offerings, and learning strategies broad enough to enable each youngster to have experiences in the context of that individual's total environment. Again, reform must focus on the individual child's needs, and it must move decision making downward to the school-site level. And that is what our reform plan for intermediate and secondary education (RISE) does.

The RISE plan has some key concepts. I'll give you a few of them, and then I'll cite some examples from California and from other states around the country where those concepts have been implemented. You will then see that RISE is not another "blue sky" California idea, born in the fantasy worlds of Hollywood and Disneyland. Alternative models of education are a reality in many areas. The tragedy is that they are not a reality everywhere that the need exists. We have been deluged with tales of urban school failure, of crises in the classroom, of fact-finding committees' reports of violence and vandalism. You all know the problems. Let's talk here of alternative models that have turned education around from failure to success.

The commission which I appointed to develop better ways to educate junior and senior high school students pinpointed several areas where change had to take place and made positive recommendations for the direction that that change should take.

Assuming that the learner is the principal client of the school, the commission recommended that demonstrated proficiency, not seat hours, should be the basis of awarding credit to learners and that a system of learning options should be provided in terms of time, place, program, and formats to give learners a wide choice of ways to achieve their learning goals.

Let me cite some examples of how those recommendations translate into reality:

1. In California we have a proficiency examination open to anyone over sixteen which, if passed, provides the equivalent of a high school diploma. That diploma qualifies the holder to enter the job market or continue with further postsecondary education. The examination in every sense tests competency. It validates and gives credit for learning wherever it was acquired.

2. In Philadelphia the Parkway Program provides a learning environment without walls. It consists of four different "schools." Each of these separately housed units explores the city's educational, cultural, and scientific institutions as part of its extended campus, using the many resources found there. The core faculty provides instruction in basic skills, offers courses in fields of expertise, and supervises tutorials. Community volunteers with special skills offer on-site programs, classes, and internships in academic, commercial, and vocational subjects.[1]

3. In Chicago, Metro High, a publicly supported school without walls, provides alternative learning environments similar to the Philadelphia Parkway Program. Education occurs in both cases in real-life situations, where a student, with the help of a skilled teacher, learns from people with varied talents and interests--scientists, reporters, lawyers, electricians, artists, businessmen--and in sessions at metro headquarters. Whether students are studying at Shedd Aquarium; Lincoln Park Zoo; in one of Chicago's major newspapers, radio or TV stations; or acting with a professional theatrical group, learning is taking place, not only in the specialized field but in the so-called traditional basic skills as well.[2]

4. In California, students from Los Angeles inner-city schools are bused--not for integration purposes, although the students represent many different racial and ethnic groups--but for work-experience classes at places such as Rockwell-International's Southern California complex. At Rockwell, students learn to type by typing engineering reports on space-shuttle equipment. They learn welding by working on equipment manufactured by Rockwell. In short, every skill is learned by actual experience with current equipment on current projects, and the foremen and supervisors who donate their time to this project hold the students to precisely the same standards they would have to meet as employees. Why the generosity on the part of Rockwell-International? Those youngsters are potential employees, and they want them trained right. There is no absenteeism, no dropout from this program.

What other recommendations did the RISE Commission offer? The Commission suggested that there should be a mastery of essential skills by all learners, particularly the skills of reading, writing, and computation. The members felt that there should be instructional emphasis on social concepts that reflect present and future needs and concerns. In addition, the Commission members--who included representatives from labor, business, industry, the arts, education, students, and the community in general--recommended that planned and continuing experiences be provided to enable learners and staff to be in contact with people whose racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, or cultural backgrounds are different from their own.

How can these recommendations be implemented outside the traditional patterns of education? What alternative models are there for reaching these educational goals?

1. In Albuquerque, New Mexico, at Rio Grande High School, they have begun to mesh basic skills into their work-study programs, adding such courses as "English-on-the Job," and "Math-on-the-Job" to improve the relevancy of the basic skills to on-the-job training. At Rio Grande, they are making a connection between the social realities of the city and the school's curriculum. One of the courses offered is starkly labeled "Survival." I know of no more relevant topic for urban education.[3]

2. In Minnesota, the Minneapolis Urban Arts Program has in the past six years brought 49 percent of the school

district's 53,000 students--19 percent of whom are from the minority population--into urban art classes and workshops. Daily workshops are the mainstay of the program. The choices are wide: architecture, art history, ceramics, design arts, film-making, graphic arts, photography, sculpture, ballet, and so on through the whole spectrum of the arts. Students not only find outlets for creative expression but, through the commingling of groups from various sectors of the community in common activities, such as dance workshops, they find hostility and racial tensions disappear. The youngsters see people instead of stereotypes.[4]

3. In Cleveland, Willson Junior High is an inner-city school with a student population comprised of many ethnic groups including Eastern Europeans, Appalachian whites, Chinese, blacks, Puerto Ricans, and others. In order to overcome the feeling of their students that somehow as inner-city children they were different and even inferior to suburban youngsters, the school undertook an exchange program with suburban junior highs. The first year each school sent fifteen students to spend the entire day at the exchange school. The students were each assigned a "host" with whom they spent the entire day. From the three suburban schools selected the first year, the program has grown to seven. The number of students exchanged has increased from fifteen to thirty-five for each school. The results over the years have been positive. Students no longer feel isolated from the rest of society. They work hard to be part of interschool cultural and athletic exchange groups. Regardless of cultural and economic differences, strong friendships have grown up between suburban and inner-city students. Willson Junior High is not an island cut off from the mainstream of society.[5]

4. In Kansas City, Missouri, filed away in the Dangerous Buildings Division of City Hall, is a thick folder labeled "Case No. 3114." It is more than a stack of papers. It is a case history of a teacher who cared enough about kids to help them learn how to do something about the dilapidated condition of their neighborhood. The youngsters at Franklin School learned that City Hall was not an impregnable fortress accessible only to the rich. They learned how to collect evidence and present data so that action would be taken by the appropriate authorities to upgrade the condition of inner-city neighborhoods. (That teacher must have read Teaching is a Subversive Activity.)[6]

Finally, the RISE Commission made a series of recommendations concerning the need for involving parents and students in local and

school-level decision making and for improving staff-student relationships. In short, the Commission felt strongly that no matter what was done to make education more flexible, no improvement would be possible unless youngsters learned to develop personal values, self-esteem, responsibility, and the skills to deal with personal problems. A few examples of alternative strategies in these areas may stimulate your own thinking:

1. In Lansing, Michigan, a decentralization process called "Responsible Autonomy" was established to make it possible for programmatic decisions to be made at the classroom or building level. Each individual school community was given the freedom to set educational objectives and act toward attainment of those objectives. A myriad of alternative programs have been implemented to address different learning styles and different life-styles. The district now has some twelve alternative education centers serving about 800 students. Dropout rates are down substantially for all student groups--Chicano, black, and white. Vandalism and disruptions have all but vanished as school problems. Each school has a community participation committee. Community representatives serve on staff selection and facility planning committees. There is a junior board of education which meets with the elected board on a regular basis to discuss student needs and concerns.[7]

2. In New Haven, in 1969, Richard C. Lee High School was in a tense situation as were two other high schools in the city. Police were required to maintain order in the schools. By the end of 1969, the superintendent of schools and all three high school principals had resigned. At Lee High two new administrators were selected--an educator and a social worker. Four basic principles guided the new administrators: (1) recognition that the school does not exist in a social vacuum but is part of a larger society; (2) willingness to evaluate critically and, where needed, to modify faculty staff structure and terminate inadequate staff members; (3) commitment to a high level of administrative visibility and accessibility to students, staff, and the total community; (4) conviction that conflict is to be redefined as a problem in interpersonal relationships as opposed to rule-breaking behavior. A school-community governance group of elected student, parent, and teacher representatives was created to act as a forum for airing and resolving controversial issues. Six community social workers were hired to become

part of the school's community liaison effort. Personnel committed to the projected change were retained, and others were reassigned. The role of teachers and administrators was redefined as a caring, concerned educative role as opposed to an authoritarian role. The student senate was given increased responsibility for developing patterns of social control. It took two years, but Lee High made good on the new principles, and the new principal made good. Conflict disappeared, and a climate for learning was reestablished.[8]

3. A few years ago, the Richmond, Virginia, school board appointed a new superintendent who made some bold statements and then followed up on them. "Quite frankly," the superintendent said, "I've grown tired of hearing excuses as to why children in urban schools can't read. I don't believe any of them. Further, I'm also convinced that children from an urban school system, particularly children from a poverty background, need to read just as much or more than the so-called advantaged child. We can't afford to have unemployable children coming out of our schools--children who can't read." The Richmond superintendent made it official policy that all employees would have to focus their attention upon reading. He laid out a plan which required teachers to learn to teach reading or forego salary increases. He then followed that mandate with levels of reading competence which children had to reach before passing from one school level to another, including a minimum standard for graduation. One year later, standardized test scores indicated that the basic reading skills of urban children in Richmond, Virginia, had improved. Math improvement is next on the list.[9]

4. In Chicago, a school superintendent, upset that many of his eighth-grade pupils could not read above a sixth-grade level, decided to make more than half of his students repeat the eighth grade the next year. Because he had been communicating with parents about the problem all year long, the parents were overwhelmingly behind him. It is interesting to note that when the youngsters who were retained were interviewed on national television, they too supported the action. Those who graduated had made substantial progress because their parents had become involved in their education, and the pupils were made to feel worthwhile.

As you see, there are many alternative routes to success in urban education. As the superintendent in Richmond, Virginia, said about reading, I say about all learning. There is no reason why an urban child should fail. Unless, that is, we, as educators, fail

to do all that is necessary to meet that child's unique needs and take the youngster from where he is to where he should be--a participating and contributing member of society--by any route possible. No one handed down a single school system engraved on tablets of stone and decreed, "This and no other." There are many more models than I have given. Find the tool that fits your system to the child, and you will find that urban schools, with all their environmental and socioeconomic problems, can enjoy success.

Notes

1. I. Ezra Staples, "Affecting Disaffected Students: The Philadelphia Story," Educational Leadership, March 1977, 422-28.

2. Mary Frances Crabtree, "Chicago's Metro High: Freedom, Choice, Responsibility," Phi Delta Kappan, May 1975, 613-15.

3. Lovola Burgess, "Accelerating Change in Urban Education," NASSP Bulletin, May 1975, 74-79.

4. Michael W. Feddo, "Much More Than 'Eating Goober Peas,'" American Education, October 1976, 27-30.

5. Mel Gross, "Everyone's Grass is Not Greener," NASSP Bulletin, January 1975, 101-02.

6. Marion V. Pike, "Kids Tear Down Buildings," DER Report, June 1973, 6-7.

7. I. C. Candoli, "The Urban School System," Theory into Practice, October 1976, 243-52.

8. Robert Schreck, et al., "The Metamorphosis of Lee High School," Urban Education, July 1975, 198-211.

9. H. B. Pinkney, "Urban Education: The Rhetoric Goes On," NASSP Bulletin, March 1975, 46-50.

Discussion

The questions following Mr. Riles' speech were all inquiries into the reforms Mr. Riles would like to see in California, and ways to implement change in a state school system. Mr. Riles said that one of the most important reforms he is working toward is the change from daily attendance to average daily membership as the criterion for funding public schools. This change in financing would allow schools to be much more flexible in their programs and would permit the introduction of other reforms, such as internships outside of the school. That would mean that students might be in an office, a factory, or engaged in some other form of planned activity outside of the school, without the school forfeiting any money.

The second change in policy would be the shift from crediting "seat time" in school to truly following the principles of individualized instruction, in other words, giving credit for proficiencies instead of numbers of classes taken. This would allow some students to complete school in twelve years, and some in nine or ten. The lockstep of every child at a certain age being in a certain place is great for the institution but makes no sense for the individual at all. The academic senate of the University of California recently told Mr. Riles it wanted to change the English requirement to four years of high school English. Mr. Riles pointed out that what they were trying to do was not make students take another year of English, but assure that when they got into college they could read and write at a certain level. The obvious approach to this is not the traditional conception of classes taken, but some means of establishing a level of proficiency for entrance requirements.

Mr. Riles discussed at length the problems of effecting change and suggested ways to ensure the smooth implementation of whatever changes the superintendents decide to make in their system. First, a task force might be created, composed of twenty or twenty-five educators and noneducators, and which would be instructed to suggest reforms in response to a specific set of problems. It is important to give them a short time span (six months to a year) to make their recommendations and to tell them not to worry about implementation. Implementation is your job; what you want from them is what they think ought to be. Once you have their recommendations, move ahead with them politically (in the sense of persuading your constituents and working within the system instead of from an adversary position). You must have parent involvement because active parents are all you have, and in California only 28 percent of the people have children in school. If you are going to try to pass anything in the legislature, said Mr. Riles, those parents are your only real constituency.

Second, begin a serious discussion of implementation strategies. This includes both negotiating on various points recommended by the task force and the involvement of a wide variety of people. Decide which schools are to be affected first, over which social class lines (you have to be sure you get middle-class support for your program, so plan on including middle-class schools in your first trials of the changes). Allow for a great deal of decision making at the local level so that parents and educators are able to adapt the suggested reforms to their specific needs, in accordance with their own ideas about education. Alert administrators to possible problems (e.g., initial tension between parent and teacher groups or trouble establishing communication networks between groups) and advise them on the best way to deal with them. Make sure you don't burn any bridges, so that if you can't implement a plan one year, you can always bring it up again when your opponents are ready to negotiate for something they need.

In addition, you must build incentives for success into your program. In Title I, for example, once a school succeeds in bringing its students' achievement up to average, it loses its funding; therefore, the program ends. The next group of students doesn't get the services, and so on. The incentive is to keep the students below average. What has worked in California has been to say that if a new program is successful, it can be expanded and additional funding will be provided; but if a school is not successful it cannot expand, although it can keep its present funds. Very often the demonstration schools get themselves together and succeed the following year, so the program can then be expanded. The difficulty lies in holding firm to not allowing expansion until a program works. This can become a very political issue. You must stick to the rules and make sure others know that you won't play games. Be prepared to go to key individuals and lay out the facts on your evaluation of new programs so people understand the decisions that are made when you are implementing your changes. Provide for staff development, including principals, allowing the staff to decide what it needs to learn in order to meet the requirements of the changes--have concrete goals.

Changes can be implemented, but you have to be ready to deal with political realities. You have to understand that the essential involvement is at the school site; the real decision making goes on in the classroom and in the principal's office. You had better ensure that there is local support and involvement; and one way to do this is to encourage the kind of flexibility that allows for local alternatives within the overall plan.

Restructuring Urban Education--From Bureaucracy Toward the Total Learning Community

David Seeley

New York City is once again in the throes of a discussion about the governance of its public schools. The mayor's proposal to abolish the lay board of education and substitute a mayoral commissioner is but the latest indication of dissatisfaction with the present system. While some are strongly for or against the mayor's proposal, many more wonder what difference it would make. So many changes have been tried and have failed that the question of governance has become a tiresome subject. Even State Education Commissioner Ewald Nyquist, who says he favors the mayor's proposal, calls it "a bad idea whose time has come." His reasoning: five changes have been made in the top governing structure of the city schools since 1962--all to no avail. We therefore might as well try this new idea.[1]

This paper will suggest that the reason why previous changes in the Board of Education have accomplished so little is that none of them dealt with the basic problem, which is not the structure at the top, but the entrenched bureaucracy underneath it. It is very clear both to those who have had to deal with large city school systems, and to those who have studied them, that "control of education has passed out of the hands of lay boards and into the hands of bureaucracies," and that the large school bureaucracies themselves have become increasingly inefficient, ineffective, and resistant to change.[2] While there has been much rhetoric about change, there has been little actual change in the schools or classrooms themselves.[3] It is time to recognize that the bureaucratic structure of our large city school systems is a major reason why this is so.[4]

This paper will review briefly how we developed our bureaucratic school structures, the pathologies that have developed within them, and some remedies that can help us change and transform them into structures that will enable us to rebuild urban education to meet the needs of city children in the coming decades.

Historical Perspective:

When the gods wish to punish us, they answer our prayers. Are today's mindless school bureaucracies the "answered prayers" of America's educational reformers? Horace Mann's biographer, Jonathan Messerli, claims that

> Mann and his countless coworkers could not conceive of the possibility that those who would follow in their footsteps might actually build a suffocating and sometimes mind-numbing establishmentarian bureaucracy. Nor could they envision that in the hands of lesser individuals their cherished institution, instead of functioning as a fundamental part of the social solution they sought, could become an integral part of the problem.[5]

Diane Ravitch writes that in New York City the great school leaders at the turn of the century quite consciously built an administrative structure that was "highly centralized, highly professionalized, and highly bureaucratized . . . [with] minimal provision for public involvement in school policy."[6] New York was typical of developments in school administration throughout the country.

Some historians claim that these "reformers" purposely created bureaucratic school systems to provide a docile pool of trained manpower for our growing industrial machine.[7] Others produce evidence of the intentions of the white Protestant American middle classes to impose their cultural values on the lower classes and the new immigrants as a major reason for shifting control of public education to a professional bureaucracy, immune from the politics of poor neighborhoods and polyglot "newcomers," but under the continuing influence of the dominant groups.[8]

Others find simpler explanations for the development of bureaucratic school systems: between 1820 and 1860 urbanization created "the pressure of numbers [which] was a main reason for the bureaucratization that gradually replaced the older, decentralized village pattern of schooling."[9] Between 1880 and 1920 the corporate bureaucracy, with a single chief executive, an orderly chain of command, role differentiation, and uniform policies, gained increasing influence as an appropriate model for the educational "progressive experts" and the "business and professional men" who spearheaded the centralization movement and later sat on the small lay boards of education.[10] Furthermore, once bureaucracy was established, much of the pathology we see today can be explained through the natural tendency of job holders to seek greater power and security. The demands for professionalization provided an excellent reason to enlarge supervisory and administrative staffs to their present awesome size.[11]

Whatever the explanations of why we built our great city school systems on the model of corporate bureaucracies, history confronts us with the fact that this is what we did. Until we understand the nature of these bureaucracies and how they stand as obstacles to educational effectiveness in our city schools, there will be little chance of improving the governance of urban education.

The Pathologies of Large School Bureaucracies:

While bureaucratic organization has advantages for certain kinds of functions, it has severe disadvantages when applied to a function like education, in a large city, and in a society that purports to be democratic. The more we study how large educational bureaucracies work, the easier it is to see why they are so inefficient, so educationally ineffective, and so likely to violate basic democratic values such as individualism, fairness, political accountability, and respect for pluralistic values.

It is ironic that what was supposed to be one of the more obvious advantages of bureaucratic organization for large city school systems--namely simple efficiency or "more bang for the buck"--has become in practice one of its more obvious disadvantages.

The public is likely to hear only about the sensational examples of inefficiency, such as purchasing school supplies at 30 percent above their price in the local supermarket or stationery store, or spending millions of dollars extra for tests from a publisher who has given the head of the school system's research department over $400,000 in "royalties" and fees.[12] But these examples are just the tip of the iceberg. As we look deeper into the operations of the large school bureaucracies, we find that whole subsystems, such as custodial and lunch services, or building maintenance, are grossly inefficient. When we look deeper still, we find that the basic processes of budgeting and spending money are not even based on principles of efficiency. Money is added to the budget or cut from the budget, as the case may be, not on the basis of what will add the most to, or detract the least from, the educational mission of the system, but on principles that have more to do with the interests of the bureaucracy than the interests of those whom it is intended to serve.

These characteristics of bureaucratic school systems are not limited to New York City or to any given period of time. We must begin to see that they are quite natural tendencies of this type of organization. For in a public bureaucracy there are no

"mechanisms available to harness . . . self-seeking to the public interest." As a consequence, Jacob Michaelsen argues:

> Each bureaucrat, then, will seek in good faith to maximize the activities over which he has control. In a word, budgets rather than profits are maximized. Larger budgets will also help the bureaucrat to survive, to increase his prestige, to buy out of conflict, and generally to gain control over his environment. Thus, self-seeking behavior can easily be masked in a bureaucratic setting.[13]

The result of these natural incentives in a large school system is an educational process that has come to cost more and more and deliver less and less education per dollar spent.[14] The budget of the New York City school system increased from under $300 million in the early 1950s to almost $3 billion in the early 1970s, and few would argue that the public has received commensurate benefit from this huge increase. There is every prospect that if we maintain our present type of organizational system we will continue to increase costs without regard to benefits or--if the money turns out to be more limited, and it appears that it will--we will increasingly cut back on services to pay for ever-increasing costs.

What must be realized is that the inefficiency of the system is not limited to such areas as purchases and building maintenance, but that it even more seriously affects the educational process itself. There is nothing more "inefficient" than a classroom in which learning is not taking place, or a school where children are learning defeat and alienation. As we shall see, the bureaucratic model of organization in large city school systems militates against good educational results, and this is the greatest inefficiency of all.

The more we see our large school bureaucracies in operation, the more we see why they are so educationally ineffective: they denigrate the two key people in the educational process--the teacher and the learner.

Bureaucracy and professionalism are like oil and water--they do not mix.[15] One is based on hierarchical authority, the other on the authority of expertise. One emphasizes the ability of the supervisor to control the behavior of the subordinate official; the other emphasizes the individual responsibility of the professional to carry out a professional mission. In our educational bureaucracies the teacher is at the "bottom" of the

system whereas, educationally, the teacher should be the heart of the whole process.[16]

By the nature of a bureaucracy, the main method of control from above is through policies and rules, and for practical reasons these have to be the more easily enforceable rules.[17] A teacher can teach best, however, not by following rules but by interacting intelligently and creatively with a group of students. The result of bureaucracy at its silliest is the system which cares more whether teachers have their window shades drawn to the prescribed level than whether children are learning. And the same forces that produce such ludicrous examples operate pervasively to deaden the ability of teachers to teach.

It is not that bureaucracies cannot use professional workers effectively under certain circumstances. General Motors can hire engineers and lawyers and put them to work productively in the business of making money. When the goals are clear and accountability strong, professional skills can often be combined with a bureaucratic organization to good effect. But in our large school bureaucracies we seem to have the worst of both worlds. Teachers and principals can proclaim their professionalism to avoid accountability from above, but then they can act as "employees" who need do only what they are told--which is often confused, and sometimes nothing at all.[18]

The worst aspects of professional guild instincts tend to be reinforced. A slavish adherence to seniority, for instance, satisfies the protectionist instinct of a professional group as well as fitting in comfortably with the desire of the bureaucracy to operate by simple, easily enforceable rules. The result, however, militates against the profession's commitment to its mission and against the bureaucracy's interest in merit.[19] Likewise reward for merit, either in terms of pay or promotion, which is quite normal in an organization disciplined by the profit motive, is hardly ever found in bureaucratic school systems, where "professionalism" is defined to preclude competition, and where the bureaucracy is comfortable with "interchangeable parts" which fit into the organization chart in an orderly, rational way.[20]

The downgrading of the teacher in the bureaucratic hierarchy is bad enough. The student is in even worse shape: he is not seen as part of the educational system at all. Instead, the student is the "client" of the system--the person "served" by the system--or perhaps the "target" of the system.[21]

This may seem rational enough, if the system is a hierarchically organized group of employees, each with a specific job to do, each trained and supervised to do that job, and controlled by a set

of rules and policies that are a condition of employment. The student, his family, and community are quite naturally seen as "outside" such a system. Students are, after all, unpredictable and varied and not subject to the disciplines of employment, and their families and communities are even further outside the "span of control" of the bureaucratic order.

The only trouble is that such concepts work against the fundamental spirit of the educational process. Students are the most important "producers" in education; they have to do most of the work in producing learning.[22] They must be perceived as an integral part of the process, not as the targets of the process. Everyone else in the educational system--teachers, principals, counselors, librarians, etc.--are best thought of as facilitators of student learning, not as the prime producers of learning. Children are not like raw material that needs processing, that can be stacked and sorted and efficiently dealt with by a mechanical bureaucracy.[23] Education is a matter of growth and development of complex individuals, who not only vary from one to another but from one minute to the next.

Albert Hirschman pointed out that organizations often fail to make sufficient use of "resources and abilities that are hidden, scattered, or badly utilized."[24] The greatest unused "resource" is students themselves, who, while they are seen as outside the system--even a well intentioned system--are less likely to be engaged in helping to produce their own learning. Frank Reissman urged that we shift from a compensatory model to a "strength" model in urban education.[25] But the bureaucratic organizational conception is not comfortable dealing with the "strength" of those it is "serving," since this strength is outside its control mechanisms. It is more comfortable conceiving of students as passive and inert, available for its ministrations.[26]

Not only do bureaucratic educational systems tend to underutilize or misuse teaching and learning resources, but their natural reactions to ineffective education often make matters worse. When parents complain of poor education and demand "accountability" from the system, there is a tendency to increase bureaucratic control from the top, which may well cause further misuse and abuse of teachers and learners and thus produce even worse educational results.[27] There is a tendency to add more administrators, supervisors and central office staff, which not only diverts available resources from the classroom, but may increase interference with the teaching-learning process. One study, for instance, shows that the higher the proportion of administrators to teachers, the lower the academic achievement.[28]

All in all, the bureaucratic system of organization is a monstrosity from an educational point of view. It oppresses teachers and administrators as well as students. As one scholar put it, there is something inherent in the nature and ethos of bureaucratic organizations as they have evolved in America that causes them to "'sanitize' and thereby impoverish the lives of people they touch."[29] No wonder that Walter Mondale could conclude that "We are mutilating the spirits of millions of American children every day and it surely is a sin."[30]

Even if our educational bureaucracies were efficient and effective--and as we have seen they are neither--they would still present us with serious problems because their natural methods of operating violate some of the most fundamental values of our type of society: individualism, pluralism, political accountability, and fairness.[31]

One of the main virtues of the bureaucratic organization is that it can deal with masses of people and things on an organized basis. But to do so it must be able to categorize and manipulate these elements on a rational basis. It is this which leads to the charge that bureaucracies "dehumanize" people.[32] Society may decide to pay the price of this dehumanization for certain types of enterprise, such as the army, where the need for rule-following behavior is strong and the sacrifice of individualism is voluntary or temporary. We have seen how, for education, such an approach interferes with the learning process. But in addition to its ineffectiveness, it is also fundamentally repugnant to our values. We want an educational system that will enhance individual responsibility rather than create docile, dependent personalities. The growing objections to "labeling" handicapped children and the new federal requirements for developing an "Individualized Education Plan" for each student represent a revolt against the normal behavior of our educational bureaucracies. These challenges are likely to spread beyond the field of special education.[33]

Closely related to their violation of individualism is the way in which bureaucratic systems tend to deny family and diverse cultural values. The "upward" direction of bureaucracies looks away from the family level, and the diversity of values represented in a pluralistic society is an annoyance to a system which is established on the basis of uniform rules and policies. Indeed it is one of the supposed "virtues" of the system that it treats everyone the same.[34] Historically, as we have seen, one of the purposes of an isolated professional bureaucracy was to facilitate the assimilation of people from various cultural backgrounds into a single American culture, and the structure of the system is admirably suited to this purpose. It has great difficulty, for instance, adjusting to pluralistic values which might interfere

with free transfer of staff within the system based on an "interchangeable parts" conception.

Beyond individuals and families, one could say that our bureaucratic school systems deny the rights and interests of entire communities, in that they have become increasingly remote from responsible political accountability. Harmon Zeigler, one of our foremost students of school governance, and his associates have pointed out that our present arrangement "violates a fundamental principle of democratic institutions," in that boards of education have little real control and are very imperfectly accountable to the public.[35] And Jacob Michaelsen wrote:

> Full tax support and compulsion firmly established the power of common school administrators and, in a different way, teachers over parents and children. Indeed they created the essential conditions for insulating school management from citizens generally, namely the assurance of a budget independent of satisfied customers.[36]

Michaelsen also noted that those within the bureaucracy have much greater opportunity to organize politically to maintain their position, unlike the client community which is usually unorganized and without the necessary resources for effective political representation.

One of the ironies of the situation, which clearly reveals the basic structural inappropriateness of the bureaucratic organization, is that the more "responsive" a board of education is, the less "efficient" the system will be in terms of its own organizational principles. A board of education which is highly responsive to the clients of the system will constantly be interfering with school administration, and with the professional roles of those within it. This is one of the reasons, as was pointed out in our brief historical review, that the original idea was to "remove the school system from politics."[37] We lose either way with this kind of system: bureaucratic efficiency means weak accountability to communities served, and accountability means reduced efficiency.

Lastly, and most ironically, we find that our bureaucratic school systems are unfair and inequitable, the one thing we could have hoped to avoid in an "objective," "rational," and "depersonalized" bureaucracy.[38] Both the Hobson case in Washington, D.C., and the federal Office of Civil Rights report on New York City indicate that resources tend to be allocated very unfairly, to the disadvantage of the system's most

disadvantaged clients.[39] Despite its supposed impartiality, we find that the large city bureaucracy still responds to those with power, both inside and outside the system. However, the impartial face presented by the bureaucracy to the public tends to mask its inequities, and, therefore, obstructs their correction.

The very thought patterns of the bureaucracy tend to preserve its inequities. Two schools can be considered "equal" in the bureaucratic mind so long as they have the same number of teachers per pupil and the same amount of resources, even though one may be systematically destroying the educational potential of its students. As educational sociologist Dan Lortie stated, the "conception of equality as sameness pervades organizational life."[40] This often results in the same, and therefore "equal," methods and measurable resources being applied to highly varied situations, sometimes with disastrous results for those so "served."[41]

If our bureaucratic school systems are inefficient, ineffective, and undemocratic, why aren't they changed to correct these evident evils? A bureaucratic organization, with clear command from the top and ability to hire specialized staff for research and planning might theoretically be expected to be highly adaptive to changing circumstances. The actual behavior of our large city school systems is notoriously the opposite. They have ground down and worn out virtually all efforts for reform both from within and from without. "Educators in big cities remain insulated from the massive social changes of the past twenty years and have become protectionist in the face of new demands by citizen groups."[42]

The reasons for this resistance to change are not hard to find once we combine the theoretical model of how a bureaucracy is intended to work with the realities of human behavior in the kind of systems we have established. A large bureaucracy must be governed by rules, policies, and careful job descriptions through which the work of thousands of people can be organized into a supposedly coordinated enterprise. Once people are trained to perform their respective roles, however, they develop a vested interest in preserving them. People do not like to change their habits or their working patterns. Even more important is that established bureaucracies develop informal power relationships and interests which are even less amenable to change because they are not part of the official rules and regulations which can be amended.[43]

The "top down" nature of the bureaucratic model is particularly maladaptive to the kinds of changes called for in school systems. While a superintendent or board of education may well see that educational results are not what they ought to be and that changes are needed, it is classroom teachers and principals

who are most likely to be able to develop the changes needed to get better results. But, as we pointed out, these people are at the "bottom" of the system, with little authority for initiating change. Furthermore, the top officials, operating in a political context, are likely to have much of their time and attention taken up with "putting out fires" and dealing with issues on the basis of their political urgency rather than their importance to the mission of the system.

The result is that, since real change is very difficult, the top management will respond to demands for change either by defending the bureaucracy or by superficial, faddish changes--visible new programs which can be added to existing practices and reported to the public to give the impression of innovation. Meanwhile the existing practices continue unchanged, and even the innovations, if they become too threatening to bureaucratic interests, can be co-opted into the system or squeezed out of existence once they lose public attention.[44] As long as the mandates from above are sufficiently unclear or inconsistent, which they usually are in a large, pluralistic city school system, the bureaucracy can usually wait out changes initiated from time to time.

Remedies:

One might think that with such evident flaws we would by now have found alternatives to the bureaucratic system for education. But as Max Weber wrote in his classic study of bureaucracy, "Once it is fully established, bureaucracy is among those social institutions which is hardest to destroy."[45] Indeed, there seems to be some indication that bureaucracies become increasingly entrenched with age, even as they become less productive. Diane Ravitch noted that in the "first flush" of intensive bureaucratization in New York City at the turn of the century, schools enjoyed considerable innovation and increased efficiency.[46] But, in a process which Weber refers to as the "routinization of charisma," the great minds and spirits which establish such systems tend to be replaced in time with people who, as Michaelsen says "seek instead to survive, to enlarge the scope of their activities, to gain prestige, to avoid conflict, to control the organization and content of their daily round as much as possible."[47]

In his study of the bureaucracy at 110 Livingston Street, David Rogers noted that

> The institution has organizational defenses that allow it to function in inefficient, unprofessional, undemocratic and politically

> costly ways without evoking more of a revolution or push for radical change than has yet emerged. It has an almost unlimited capacity for absorbing protest and externalizing the blame, for confusing and dividing the opposition, "seeming" to appear responsive to legitimate protest by issuing sophisticated and progressive policy statements that are poorly implemented, if at all, and then pointing to all its paper "accomplishments" over the years as evidence both of good faith and effective performance.[48]

Nevertheless, the fact that the bureaucratic system is becoming so obviously dysfunctional may give us hope that changes can be made. After all, it is only in recent years that the structure of the system itself has begun to be seen as a major source of the problem.[49] Indeed, one of our major students of management proclaims that important changes are already under way, with a shift from the bureaucratic model to a more "organic-adaptive structure," in which people are "differentiated not vertically, according to rank and role, but flexibly and functionally according to skill and professional training."[50]

As Shields stated, "institutions are man-made and can be changed; new agendas can be introduced."[51] What are some of the "new agendas" that should be considered?

1. Budget reform. The bureaucracy's control over money is a major way in which it retains its power. As we have seen, that control is not directed toward maximum efficiency or maximum learning, but toward maximum budgets and maximum stability.[52] As Charles Lindblom and Aaron Wildavsky, noted students of bureaucracy, pointed out, under a bureaucratic system "incremental" budgeting is normal and serves functional purposes for the bureaucracy.[53] The yearly "add on" of funds to cover increased costs of old programs without change, and the costs of a few new programs on top of the old ones, is the easiest way to maintain stability and the power relationships of the hierarchy.

Now that money is scarcer, the destructive aspects of incremental budgeting are becoming more evident as program cuts are made that are even more irrational than the "add ons" of more prosperous days.[54] Public pressure is mounting to insist that scarce resources be spent in accordance with the priorities of the schools' mission--the education of children--rather than the priorities of the bureaucracy.

Efforts such as those of the Educational Priorities Panel in New York City--a coalition of eighteen parent and civic groups--

to press for a shift to this kind of priority budgeting is an effort to reduce one of the most dangerous manifestations of educational bureaucracies. Unlike bureaucratic budget reforms, such as PPBS or zero-based budgeting, which some see as only more elaborate tools that enable the bureaucracy to further its own interests, the reforms advocated by the Educational Priorities Panel, as a coalition of outside groups, attempt to bring the client interest to bear on the budget decisions.[55] If appropriating authorities, such as legislatures, city councils and county commissions, can be persuaded to pay more attention to client groups, rather than simply rubber stamping (or for that matter mindlessly rejecting) the budgets presented by school bureaucracies, some of the wastefulness of present school systems might be reduced, while at the same time school policy might be opened to greater public participation.

2. School level management. A reform gaining increasing momentum is to shift decision-making authority as much as possible to the school level--a concept which has been given the ungainly label of "school-site management." This was recommended by both the City Club of New York and the Public Education Association (PEA) in the 1960s. PEA, for instance, recommended in 1969: "planning councils at each city high school, where representatives of the student body, staff and community can get the help of people from labor, business and the universities in building new programs that will work." School-site management is now also a major recommendation of the Aspen Institute program on school reform, which is concluding three years of intensive study of the ills of, and cures for, public education in America in the coming decades.[56]

Some elements of this approach are now being tried in New York City under the auspices of the Economic Development Council and the Urban Coalition.[57] Thus far in a number of New York schools, the approach has started the various parties talking together and developing a mutual "self-help" attitude, which is an important beginning step in one of the most highly bureaucratized systems in the country.[58] Elsewhere the approach, more fully advanced, shows signs of creating a school climate quite different from the traditional bureaucratic model. Ultimately, if enough responsibility is shifted to the school level, particularly in the areas of budget and personnel, school staff could begin to assume more responsibility for results, more pride in their work; and a closer relationship could grow among teachers, students, parents and community. In any large system there doubtless will result a mixture of policies--those made by the central authority and those made at the school level--but a school-site management approach could greatly increase the empowerment of teachers, parents, and students alike, thereby reducing some of the worst evils of the bureaucratic structure.

3. Decentralization of very large systems. While the individual school unit is undoubtedly the most effective unit for most school decision making, some decisions and monitoring must occur at levels above the school. There is no agreement on the ideal size for such decision-making units, but it is clear that our largest cities are far beyond any manageable size. Even such a visible and important function as choosing a school principal is impossible to perform or monitor effectively in a system of over 900 schools, such as in New York. Hence the drive to decentralize. So-called "administrative decentralization," achieved by voluntary delegation of authority to "area superintendents" and other intermediate echelons is not likely to have much effect on the basic bureaucratic structure, because political accountability will always require that too many decisions rise to the "top." But local jurisdictions with real authority to make decisions can change the structure of the bureaucracy by providing intermediate levels where "the buck stops," and therefore where client participation can be effective.

New York City's decentralization law of 1969 was a particularly botched-up affair which gave overlapping authority to both local and central units, leaving the previous bureaucratic structure intact. The newly created local jurisdictions could only struggle in frustration to carve out roles for themselves. Retention of central control over personnel and budget has particularly emasculated the local boards. The fact that the law also created an election system for the local boards which--because of the large number of candidates and lack of information about them--is almost impossible for the average citizen to comprehend, also has undermined the legitimacy of the local boards.

If properly carried out, however, with clearly defined functions and decision-making authority at the various levels of the system, decentralization can mitigate some of the worse excesses of a very large bureaucratic system.

4. "Truth in bargaining." The corporate-style bureaucratic structure we chose for our school systems brought with it in due course corporate-style unions and labor relations. In the bureaucratic model, teachers, instead of being the central professional personnel in the system, are only cogs in a machine--the least significant employees in the hierarchy. Partly in reaction to this low status, teachers formed strong unions to challenge the power of the bureaucracy. Ironically, while teacher unions have succeeded in dramatically gaining power at the expense of the higher officials of the bureaucracy (principals, headquarters staff, board members), the result in some ways has been to make the system more bureaucratic than ever. Increasing numbers of crucial decisions are made at the "top," without reference to particular circumstances and relationships in individual schools,

with little or no parent or public voice, often even in total secrecy.[59] Not only do parents feel increasingly alienated from the system, but even teachers have gained their group power at the expense of further loss of individual judgment and control over their work, which is at the heart of professional identity.[60] As the British educators who recently visited New York City schools pointed out, "The wooden-horse in the system is the teachers' contract."[61]

Collective bargaining is here to stay, but there has been increasing understanding in recent years that public-sector bargaining is very different from bargaining in private industry, and that adjustments must be made to reflect the fact that in the public sector it is basically a political rather than an economic process.[62] Public policy decisions are made at the bargaining table (and in related backroom political dealings) which determine how public money will be spent and how schools will be run. The decisions are made in secret, and by boards of education that are often politically accountable to the very unions with which they are bargaining.

A number of ideas have been proposed to open these decisions to greater public discussion and debate, such as more extensive review of contract demands, analysis of the effects of existing contracts, cost estimates of proposed new benefits, statements on the impact of proposed new "working conditions" on the delivery of educational services to children, public hearings before contracts are ratified, and "split level" bargaining to permit the more detailed working conditions to be ironed out at the school level where individual teachers and parents can have more voice in the decisions. As a start in this direction, a joint task force of the Public Education Association and the United Parents Association in New York City has proposed a campaign for "Truth in Bargaining" which calls for public disclosure of the full costs and impact on services before new obligations are entered into by the school system. While this is only a beginning to the reforms needed, it would considerably change the dynamics of the bargaining process and help to open up the bureaucracy to both parent and individual teacher influence.

5. The total learning community. Another growing force that may help to change bureaucratic school structures is the movement to extend education into community institutions, employment experiences, and educational options outside the regular school program. At least five major national commissions and two reports prepared within the New York City school system during the past five years have recommended such a broadening of public education; and leading educators such as Lawrence Cremin of Teachers College have become vigorous advocates of this approach.[63] The Public Education Association has had a task

force working since September 1976 under grants from the New York Community Trust and the Hazen Foundation to explore the feasibility of such a "total learning community" for New York City.[64]

It is already clear that a movement from a "school" system to an "educational" system, as John Henry Martin, chairman of one of the national commissions has put it, would have profound implications for the bureaucratic structure of the schools. It will confront us with an important choice: should such a diverse educational system, including museums, volunteer community projects, employment opportunities, and public media, be organized under a yet bigger and more extensive bureaucratic structure, or should other forms of organization be found to accommodate the many diverse elements of such a system and provide for public accountability, collective bargaining, financing, personnel administration and other essential functions by techniques other than the classic pyramidal hierarchy of the bureaucracy? The evident impracticality of the first option should increase the chances that we will pursue the second. Indeed experience with pilot projects such as street academies, internships, mini-schools, and public television points in this direction.

The extraordinary response of Columbus, Ohio, to its month-long school shutdown in the 1977 energy shortage is significant on this score. School Superintendent John Ellis, instead of "hunkering down" to preserve the status quo until schools could open again, took the leadership to open up the educational process to the entire community. He persuaded students, teachers, community, the union, and perhaps most importantly, his own subordinates in the school bureaucracy, to "suspend the rules" during the emergency and find every possible way to use the community's resources to help educate children. A great sense of liberation resulted as Columbus became a "total learning community" for one month. Some think that Columbus will never be the same again. The community has been given a taste of what education might be like once we escape from the stultifying and isolating structures we have set up to separate our schools from our communities.[65]

6. Student choice. Some think that efforts to "de-bureaucratize" our school systems are doomed to failure, and that in any case education should be based more on individual student and family choice. The most noted proposal in this direction is the "voucher" plan, which would put public funds directly into the hands of parents, enabling them to buy their children's education on the open market.[66] This radically changes accountability from the kind provided by a bureaucratic system. When dissatisfied with a school, a parent, instead of trying to find some way to give "voice" to his complaint in order to get the bureaucracy to change the school, is instead given a means of

"exit" from the school altogether so he can seek another more to his liking.[67]

There are both very attractive aspects and very serious problems about the voucher idea, and it is certainly a controversial one. It would clearly threaten those with vested interests within present school bureaucracies, and some feel that it would destroy public education altogether and create a highly stratified, segregated, "private" school system supported by public funds.[68] While these arguments are vigorously countered by proponents, there is little movement toward full voucher systems in American public education at the present time.

There is, however, a growing movement for giving students and their parents more choices <u>within</u> a public school system.[69] "Options and alternatives" are becoming almost a fad, to the point where there may be a danger of creating alternative programs without the necessary systems for accountability, funding, and counseling to enable the alternatives to function effectively and protect students from inferior education. If the movement continues to gain momentum, which it probably will, it is possible that we will begin to approach the voucher idea from the back door, and in the process develop new support and accountability structures and new definitions of "public" and "private" that will permit a greater diversity of choice within a system of public accountability.

Conclusion:

Can the bureaucratic structures of our large city school systems be changed? Of course they can, but not without resistance from those whose jobs or work habits would be threatened.[70] Not without considerable inventiveness and trial and error to develop new and more effective structures. And most important of all, not without more understanding both by professionals and by the public of the fact that the bureaucratic structure, which we now take for granted as <u>the</u> way to organize a school system, is not effective and <u>must</u> be changed.

The great danger is that people will expect change to take place more quickly than is possible. A huge and complex structure that has taken over a hundred years of laborious effort by schoolpeople to build, cannot be changed quickly.[71] The process of changing from the bureaucratic system to a new kind of organization has been under way for more than a dozen years in New York; all six of the reforms listed above have been started to one degree or another. The changes are now beginning to gain momentum as the body politic becomes more aware that there are

some fundamental problems with the way we run our schools--problems which cannot be remedied by a few gimmicky new programs spread over the surface of a basically sick system. The fact that virtually every candidate in New York's 1977 mayoral campaign has singled out education as a major issue and sees the need for strong remedial action is a sign that the deep ills of our urban school systems are no longer the subjects only for academic analysis or community demonstrations. The time has clearly come for sound fundamental reform.

Those who are disposed to give up because so little has been changed thus far may take heart from the conjecture of David Tyack, one of the most sensitive of our current educational historians: ". . . historians a hundred years hence may consider the ferment of the 1960s and 1970s to be a major turning point in the history of American education, comparable in impact to the common school crusade of the mid-nineteenth century or the program of the administrative progressives in the early twentieth century."[72] Only if we act in the spirit of this hope can our society counteract what Fred Hechinger has called America's "headlong retreat from its commitment to education." As Hechinger said, "At stake is nothing less than the survival of American democracy."[73]

Notes

1. Address of Ewald Nyquist before the United Parents Association, New York City, May 6, 1977.

2. Shields, pp. 150-151.

3. Rogers, p. 266 and throughout; Sarason, p. 47 (Sarason's comment is that "it is perhaps too charitable to conclude that 'the more things change the more they remain the same,' if only because so many people continue to be unaware that basically nothing has changed."); Katz, p. xviii.

4. Rogers, p. 266. "The temptation in diagnosing how the schools have failed is to search for scapegoats. Actually, the entire institution of public education is to blame, as are the present conditions of urban life that it confronts. Nobody can make the system work if the bureaucratic structure is not radically altered."

5. Messerli, pp. xii-xiii.

6. Ravitch, p. 185.

7. Tyack, p. 43. Tyack quotes William T. Harris, superintendent of schools in Saint Louis and later U.S. Commissioner of Education, as saying in 1871, "that in modern industrial society 'conformity to the time of the train, to the starting of work in the manufactory,' and to other characteristic activities of the city requires absolute precision and regularity. The corollary was that the school should be a model of bureaucratic punctuality and precision . . ."; Bowles and Gintis, p. 129. Their book is in large part a discussion of "the two main objectives of dominant classes in educational policy: the production of labor power and the reproduction of those institutions and social relationships which facilitate the translation of labor power into profits."

8. Greenbaum. This is the main thesis of the article.

9. Tyack, p. 38.

10. Tyack, p. 127. Also p. 28. "Convinced that there was one best system of education for urban populations, leading educators sought to discover it and implement it. They were impressed with the order and efficiency of the new technology and forms of organization they saw around them. The division of labor in the factory, the punctuality of the railroad . . . these aroused a sense of wonder and excitement in men and women seeking to systematize the schools. . . . Efficiency, rationality, continuity, precision, impartiality became watchwords of the consolidators. In short, they tried to create a more bureaucratic system."

11. Tyack, Part II, "From Village School to Urban System: Bureaucratization in the Nineteenth Century," pp. 28-77.

12. Rogers, p. 342; Educational Priorities Panel, Report to the City Council and Board of Estimate, May 16, 1977.

13. Michaelsen, p. 239.

14. Hirschman, p. 57. "But what if we have to worry, not only about the profit-maximizing exertions and exactions of the monopolist, but about his proneness to inefficiency, decay and flabbiness? This may be, in the end, the more frequent danger: the monopolist sets a high price for his products not to amass super-profits, but because he is unable to keep his costs down, or, more typically, he allows the quality of the product or

service he sells to deteriorate without gaining any pecuniary advantage in the process."

15. The literature on the conflicts between bureaucratic and professional authority is extensive. See Blau, pp. 127-135; Etzioni, ed., especially Chapter One by Lortie, pp. 1-53; and Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals."

16. Katz, p. 16.

17. Bennis, 1965, p. 5.

18. Lortie, pp. 10-15. Principals in New York City have gone to great lengths to proclaim themselves as "nonmanagerial" employees who operate primarily on the basis of orders from above. Cf.: The New York Times, editorial, "Schools without Leaders," February 27, 1973; Hearings of the New York State Public Employee Relations Board on the Council of Supervisors and Administrators claim of nonmanagerial status of principals, January-February, 1973.

19. Gouldner, p. 134.

20. Lortie, pp. 40-41.

21. Intrinsic to bureaucracy is the distinction between "client" and "bureaucrat." Berger, Berger, and Kellner, pp. 43-44, 59.

22. Seeley, 1976, p. 9; Riessman, p. 107. "My point, however, is that education and all human services is consumer-intensive and the key to increasing productivity in this sector lies in effectively engaging and mobilizing the consumer--the child."

23. This metaphor is an old one, reflecting a recognition that goes back to the turn of the century and the beginning of the "progressive" movement in education. Ironically, the progressive movement sought to solve the problem by building the "professional bureaucracy" we have today--a structure which painfully fails to fulfill the dreams of its creators. See Cremin, 1964. Illich, one of the most radical critics of the schools, is especially convincing in his analysis of how the "process" of schooling is often confused with the "substance" of learning (p. 1).

24. Hirschman, 1958, p. 5; Blau makes somewhat the same point, p. 81.

25. Riessman, pp. 88-103, "Educational Programming: Strength vs. the Compensatory Approach."

26. Berger, Berger, and Kellner, pp. 59-60. "In encountering bureaucracy, the individual does not basically do things; rather, things are done to him."

27. Zeigler, Jennings, with Peak provide a thorough discussion of school board and superintendent relationships and response to public outcry.

28. Bidwell and Kasarda, pp. 65-66. "As pupil-teacher ratios declined across districts, the two median achievement scores rose. As administrative intensity rose, the achievement scores declined."

29. Shields, p. 151.

30. Quoted in Shields, p. 151.

31. Greenbaum, pp. 423-425; Berger and Neuhaus, 1977; Umans, p. 12. Umans quotes Nyquist in July 1970 as saying, "Our present system of education is monolithic with largely homogeneous institutions, coercive, frequently repressive, and authoritarian in nature. It is a closed teaching system as against an open system of learning. As a recent author stated, it ignores the requirements of normal growth, subordinates everything to remote, centralized impersonal administration, and 'undermines the very best of our democratic ideals.' The school is still too much an institution closed off or set apart from its surrounding community."

32. Berger, Berger, and Kellner, pp. 52, 55-56. "The individual expects to be treated 'justly.' . . . The expected 'just' treatment, however, is possible only if the bureaucracy operates abstractly, and that means it will treat the individual 'as a number.' Thus the very 'justice' of this treatment entails a depersonalization of each individual case."

33. Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142); see "Improving the Handicapped Regs." in Network, published by the National Committee for Citizens in Education, April, 1977.

34. Berger, Berger, and Kellner, pp. 51-53.

35. Zeigler, Jennings, with Peak, p. 4.

36. Michaelsen, p. 236.

37. Rogers, p. 227; Zeigler, Jennings, and Peak, p. 149. They discuss how this ideological separation of education and politics has resulted in an underuse of board resources. We would emphasize the resultant unlimited control by bureaucracy.

38. Berger, Berger, and Kellner discuss why a perception of injustice is likely to occur to the individual confronting the system. This perception is likely to exist even if resources are distributed equally throughout the system.

39. Pierce, p. 6; Hobson v. Hansen, 327 Supp. 844 (DDC 1971).

40. Lortie, p. 7.

41. Umans, pp. 13-17, discusses the "human cost."

42. Rogers, p. 240.

43. Rogers discusses the pervasive influence of tradition in determining what actually happens in the schools. Sarason discusses "behavioral regularities" that are often not clearly perceived and, as a consequence, are not considered by policy makers.

44. The special ability of bureaucracy to squelch innovation is discussed by Thompson and, in New York City, by Rogers.

45. Weber, p. 16.

46. Ravitch, p. 185.

47. Michaelsen, p. 239.

48. Rogers, p. 13.

49. Bidwell and Kasarda, p. 57. "Nevertheless, the more important shortcoming of the earlier work is the failure to explore ways in which the organization of education may intervene between inputs to schooling and its outcomes."

50. Bennis, 1965; 1969.

51. Shields, pp. 153-154.

52. Michaelsen, p. 239.

53. Lindblom; Wildavsky, 1964.

54. Pierce discusses at length the disadvantages of centralized budgeting; Seeley, p. 13.

55. See Educational Priorities Panel, Report to the City Council and Board of Estimate, May 16, 1977.

56. Pierce, "School Site Management."

57. Seeley, p. 10; "A Brief History of School Self-Renewal in New York City."

58. Alfred Katz is probably the best known spokesman for the "self-help" movement.

59. Weber, p. 18, suggests that a tendency towards secrecy is natural in bureaucracy. "Every bureaucracy seeks to increase the superiority of the professionally informed by keeping their knowledge and intentions secret." This tendency virtually guarantees a perpetual crisis of accountability in public agencies.

60. Coleman, p. 3. Coleman discusses the positive and negative aspects of joining "corporate" groups.

61. Report: The New York Urban Coalition New York/London Middle School Conference, October 25-29, 1976, NYC, p. 10.

62. The Community at the Bargaining Table, Cheng, pp. 7-9.

63. Cremin, Public Education. The John Henry Martin Report on The Education of Adolescents begins its recommendations, p. 10: "That the unattained practice and inadequate concept of the comprehensive high school be replaced with the more practical goal of providing comprehensive education through a variety of means including the schools."

64. See "Total Learning Community" paper, Public Education Association, NYC, 1977.

65. "Columbus Rallies to Assist Closed Schools: Public Education Sustained by Community's Effort Despite Gas Crisis," The New York Times, February 20, 1977.

66. Milton Friedman was the first to suggest the voucher proposal in 1955. It was modified and popularized considerably through an OEO project done by Christopher Jencks in 1970. Discussed in Benson.

67. Hirschman, 1970; pp. 16-17.

68. Benson, pp. 40, 77.

69. Benson, p. 77, pp. 37-39. The Alum Rock Union School District voucher experiment sponsored by OEO has received mixed reviews; it was conducted within the public school system. Fantini's book explores "Public Schools of Choice" at length.

70. Rogers, p. 267-268.

71. Reconnection for Learning, p. iv.

72. Tyack, p. 207.

73. Hechinger, p. 13.

References

Books and Articles

Bennis, Warren, "Beyond Bureaucracy," 1965, pp. 3-16; "Post-Bureaucratic Leadership," 1969, pp. 165-187. Both articles are found in American Bureaucracy, ed. Warren Bennis (Transaction Books, Aldine Publishing Co., 1970).

Benson, Charles S., Education Finance in the Coming Decade (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1975).

Berger, Peter, Brigitte Berger, and Hansfried Kellner, The Homeless Mind (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1973).

Berger, Peter, and Richard Neuhaus, To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1977).

Bidwell, Charles E., and John D. Kasarda, "School District Organization and Student Achievement," American Sociological Review, 1975, Vol. 40 (February): 55-70.

Blau, Peter, and W. R. Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (San Francisco, Calif.: Chander Publishing Co., 1962).

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life (New York: Basic Books, 1976).

Cheng, Charles W., Altering Collective Bargaining: Citizen Participation in Educational Decision Making (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976).

Coleman, James, "Loss of Power," American Sociological Review, 1973, Vol. 38, No. 1.

Cremin, Lawrence, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Vintage Books, 1964) Copyright 1961.

_____, Public Education (New York: Basic Books, 1977).

Etzioni, Amitai, ed., The Semi-Professions and Their Organization (New York: Free Press, 1969).

Fantini, Mario D., Public Schools of Choice: A Plan for the Reform of American Education (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974).

Gouldner, Alvin, "Cosmopolitans and Locals," pp. 127-135. Found in Introduction to Organizational Behavior, ed. Peter Weissenberg (International Textbook Co., 1971).

Greenbaum, William, "America in Search of a New Ideal: An Essay on the Rise of Pluralism," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 44, No. 3, August 1974.

Hechinger, Fred M., "Murder in Academe: The Demise of Education," Saturday Review, March 20, 1976.

Hirschman, Albert O., The Strategy of Economic Development (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1958).

_____, Exit, Voice, and Loyalty (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1970).

Illich, Ivan, Deschooling Society (New York: Harrow Books, Harper and Row, Pub., 1970).

Katz, Alfred, and Eugene Bender, The Strength in Us: Self Help Groups in the Modern World (New York: Franklin Watts, 1976).

Katz, Michael B., Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America (New York: Praeger, 1971, 1975).

Lindblom, Charles E., "The Science of 'Muddling Through,'" Public Administrative Review, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Spring, 1959), pp. 531-538.

Lortie, Dan C., "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," pp. 1-81 in The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, ed. Amitai Etzioni (New York: Free Press, 1969).

Messerli, Jonathan, Horace Mann, A Biography (New York: Knopf, 1972).

Michaelsen, Jacob B., "Revision, Bureaucracy, and School Reform: A Critique of Katz," School Review, Vol. 85, No. 2, February 1977, pp. 229-246.

Pierce, Lawrence C., School Site Management. An Occasional Paper/ Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies (Cambridge, Mass.: Aspen Institute, 1972).

Ravitch, Diane, The Great School Wars, New York City, 1805-1973 (New York: Basic Books, 1974).

Riessman, Frank, The Inner-City Child (New York: Harper and Row, 1976).

Rogers, David, 110 Livingston Street, Politics and Bureaucracy in the New York City School System (New York: Vintage Books, 1968).

Sarason, Seymour, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971).

Seeley, David S., "Productivity in New York City's Schools," City Almanac, Vol. 11, No. 3, October 1976.

Shields, James J., Jr., "Steps for School Reform: An Agenda for Education for Democratic Political Community," Educational Studies, 1975, Vol. 6, Nos. 3/4, pp. 146-161.

Thompson, Victor A., "How Scientific Management Thwarts Innovation," pp. 121-133 in American Bureaucracy, ed. Warren Bennis (Transaction Books, Aldine Publishing Co., 1969).

Tyack, David B., The One Best System (Cambridge, Mass. Harvard Univ. Press, 1974).

Umans, Shelley, How to Cut the Cost of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

Weber, Max, "Bureaucracy." Found in Perspectives on Public Bureaucracy, ed. Fred Kramer (Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, 1973).

Wildavsky, Aaron, The Politics of the Budgetary Process (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964).

Zeigler, L. Harmon, M. Kent Jennings, with G. Wayne Peak, Governing American Schools (North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury, 1974).

Reports

The Education of Adolescents. The final report and recommendations of the national panel on high school and adolescent education. John Henry Martin, chairman and director. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Publication No. (OE)76-00004 (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1976).

Report to the City Council and Board of Estimate, May 16, 1977 by the Educational Priorities Panel, New York City.

Report: The New York Urban League New York/London Middle School Conference, October 25-29, 1976, New York City.

Reconnection for Learning. McGeorge Bundy, chairman. Report of the Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City Schools, 1967.

The Community at the Bargaining Table. A Report on the Community's Role in Collective Bargaining in the Schools. By a Study Team of the Institute for Responsive Education. Seymour Sarason, chairperson.

Towards a Total Learning Community, Public Education Association, New York City, 1977.

A Brief History of School Self-Renewal in New York City, Economic Development Council of New York City, Inc., 380 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Discussion

Dr. Seeley was first asked to describe his organization before going on to discuss such problems as the complex one of parent representation by nonrepresentative parent groups. The Public Education Association, said Dr. Seeley, is a "citizens' group of private subscription." People interested in public education in New York City have found that to be effective they have to be organized, and they have organized themselves to the point where they can sustain themselves with a paid staff. This has been possible because the New York City system, as far as public education is concerned, is larger than the systems in thirty-nine of the states, so there is a sufficient base for support. PEA should actually be considered a state citizens' organization rather than the schools' since it is so big and has access to so many resources.

One superintendent wanted to know if the PEA represented most of the different groups in New York City, and if not, how a superintendent should view the problem of parent groups that are active but not really representative in their advocacy. Dr. Seeley said that he cannot say whether or not the PEA is representative because there is no way to determine whom it really represents at any given time. In a democratic process any two people who get together and decide to advocate something are free to do so, but they have no power to impose their will on anyone. The PEA members simply get together and say that something looks like an important issue and that it would be good for their community. So they advocate it. If other people go along, fine. Dr. Seeley argued that it is more important for parents to act for themselves than for anyone to worry about being truly representative. The point is, he said, that if such a group begins to have an important part in educational decision making, the other parents at least can go through the process of saying they do not like those representatives and can put someone else in their place. At least a representational process is in existence and is a viable means of having impact on decision making within the school system.

The next topic was the emerging role of the school system bureaucracy vis-à-vis school-site management. One superintendent gave an example of the interrelationship between parents and school bureaucracies to illustrate the difficulties in making

decisions at the school level. In his school system the school board spent three years trying to decentralize educational services, but the bureaucracy continued to reassert itself and tried to return to the former centralized approach to educational decision making. According to the superintendent, this happened because, in the final analysis, the parents allowed the bureaucracy to make decisions. Decentralization was considered to be a good idea, but decisions kept rising to the top, to the central office, to be made. It seemed to the superintendent that teachers, parents, and principals were operating on a mechanism which forced decisions to the highest level, instead of to the lowest.

Another superintendent pointed out that our society is so bureaucratized that for any idea or principle to survive, it too must become bureaucratized. If you agree with this philosophy, said Dr. Seeley, you have to build organized counterbalances into the bureaucracy. While this is important for parent groups to remember, it was generally agreed that it complicates the superintendent's role enormously. The superintendent is an absolutely key person in the building of the structures which encompass constructive and collaborative counterbalances. However, if the superintendent is going to take the lead in setting up those counterbalances, how can he or she maintain a top position in the bureaucracy? Dr. Seeley observed that the superintendent must, after all, have loyalty to the system. He or she is responsible to the people in it. Those people assume that the superintendent will not be subversive, will not be creating counterpressures. Nevertheless, said Dr. Seeley, "it seems to me that you've got to do it. I leave it to your own consciences as to how."

Another problem is the citizens' disenchantment with, and withdrawal of support from, public education. Dr. Seeley said that it is imperative that citizens, in both parent and non-parent groups, be brought into the struggle to improve public education. The health of any community depends upon good school systems to attract and keep upper and middle income people. Superintendents must cultivate interest and support--it can no longer be assumed to exist naturally. Some of these groups have become alienated because the bureaucracy runs the system for its own benefit. To combat this, said Dr. Seeley, there must be a coalition of "other" groups to "gang up" on the schools, as Dr. Gifford mentioned earlier. The voucher plan, for example, had tremendous potential for being the basis of a coalition of a number of different groups. However, blacks, Puerto Ricans, white liberals, and conservatives, who could have come together on this, became disaffected. That coalition has separated and has been kept fragmented. Yet it

is potentially still there and can be cultivated if they can be convinced that public education is worth working for.

Wilson Riles suggested that superintendents must point out to the public that there cannot be strong businesses in a healthy city without good schools. In a city or district with poor schools, everyone with school-age children will move out if they can. The business community must support the schools as a good business investment. People--businessmen--understand that.

Dr. Seeley concluded with a brief discussion of our society's pluralism and the problems inherent in creating a large society that is both pluralistic and unified. Everyone has, to some extent, to be inducted into the unity of this society (which is the argument many have made for centralizing the educational system--the immigrant population scared the existing community to death!). After an era of stressing the need to "Americanize" everyone through complete assimilation, we are now beginning to recognize that we are a pluralistic society and that there are other value systems that must be respected. We must find and work with the strengths of pluralism on a national level, realizing all the while that doing this has international implications. Dr. Seeley said that pluralism must be allowed to thrive if the ultimate survival of the human race is to be possible.